# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VI.—MAY, 1892.—NO. 5.

## THE TEMPORAL POWER HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

*Osservazioni sopra la Storia Universale di Cesare Cantù del P. Giuseppe Brunengo d. C. d. G.: Roma, tipografia A. Befani, 1891; Articoli estratti dalla Civiltà Cattolica; pagg. 143.*

REVIEWING the tenth edition of the Universal History of Cesare Cantù, Father Brunengo has issued from time to time various critical notices in the *Civiltà Cattolica*. These "observations" have been put together in the form of a pamphlet. Among the categories of topics treated by the eminent historical critic, we notice that the fifth is "The Papacy and the Empire; the Temporal Power." As this last-mentioned subject is distinctly a vital topic to-day, and involves the question of the spiritual well-being of the Church by means of the Pope's temporal independence, it invites no little consideration; and I propose to dwell upon the two points which Fr. Brunengo touches in the pages of Cantù. One is the general ascendancy of the Popes over the minds and the hearts of the men and the peoples who controlled the destinies of Italy and of Europe. It was the manner of exerting this ascendancy, in a way befitting their office as Vicars of Christ, which was assured and invested with proper conditions of freedom by means of a temporal sovereignty. The other point for consideration is the bearing of this same Temporal Power on what is called the political development of Italy.

Speaking of the Temporal Power in its origin, Cantù expresses himself thus:—"When the Bishops had grown to be great person-

ages in the kingdom, it was natural that their chief (the Pope) should acquire, in relation to the State, a position that was not of the essence of his mission, still was not at variance with that mission. If already in the earliest times the Pope possessed rich estates, which were not only in keeping with his dignity, but also served to answer the demands of charity, or to build new churches and restore those in decay, it became proper to enlarge his resources when he stood at the head of persons (*i. e.* Bishops) exercising a dominant influence in the government. Pepin and Charlemagne thought it opportune to augment the possessions of the Holy See, as well for the purpose that the Lombards should not domineer over Italy, as also because they knew how much the Church could assist in restoring discipline and the reign of laws, now gone into disuse; and therefore they saw how fitting for this purpose would be the possession and use of such wealth as alone was known then, that of territorial domain." Moreover, the Pope was regarded as a judge and arbitrator, and Cantù observes that this official character was appealed to for a very frequent discharge of its duties, when the extended monarchy of Charlemagne was followed by a number of little kingdoms, balancing one another in material power. The discharge of his office as judge or arbitrator was "a popular exercise of influence which averted wars, protected the weak, lent a hearing to the appeal of right as against the abuses of power. It is, in truth, a sublime conception, that of a priest unarmed, who himself, apart from earthly interests, defines the question of right in the contests of princes, or between princes and people."

Touching on the question of the relations between the Temporal Power and the political condition of Italy, Cantù says:—"Unfortunately, to maintain in requisite independence the spiritual power in times when material force prevailed, it was found necessary to attach them to a temporal principality, lest the Pontiff of the world should be reduced to the condition of chaplain to the king, within whose jurisdiction he lived. . . . Italy derived much profit in the line of its intellectual development, but it was hampered in its political evolution." (Cantù, V, 204; VII, 589.)

How far these observations of Cantù are correct, and how far they are inaccurate, will appear most readily from a cursory inspection of the historical effects in the case; and such a sketch will suggest the logical inferences to be drawn. Another mode of treatment which would be more analytical, exhibiting the conditions

of necessity and expediency, of justice and equity, in the Pontiff's possession of a Temporal Power, would offer precisely the same conclusions ; but one weighty reason for not undertaking that mode of demonstration here is the fact that it has just been expounded for Catholic enlightened readers, in a manner truly scientific and exhaustive.[1]

In the very first ages of Christianity, the different churches, and especially that of Rome, acquired, through the free oblations of the faithful, not only the means requisite for the proper performance of divine worship and the support of the clergy, but also farms and estates, with the amplest revenues. When in his own person the Emperor Constantine had made the empire nominally Christian, he ordered the restoration of houses, possessions, fields, gardens, and everything else which had once belonged to the Church. At the same time the ecclesiastical patrimony began to receive the most extensive additions. The Christian Emperors themselves were in the first rank of benefactors ; but, passing them over, "no one", says Thomassini,[2] "is such a stranger in matters of Church History as not to know that, in those times, almost countless numbers of noblemen, as soon as they accepted the Christian faith by receiving baptism, or entered the ranks of the clergy by ordination, or adopted the monastic profession, resigned immense patrimonies, distributed the proceeds to the poor, and looked upon themselves as truly rich, when they had left all these false and deceptive riches behind them. Now it was one and the same thing then to give to the poor and to give to the Church, that nourishes all the poor. For, as all the substance of the Church was the patrimony of the poor, so whatever was dedicated to their use was wont to be consigned to the Church."

The annual revenues of the properties belonging to the churches of Rome alone, without counting the rich Basilica of Constantine, amounted in the time of the first Christian Emperor to $52,000 and more.[3] The basilica just mentioned, enjoyed a revenue of over $46,000. These sums are large indeed, considering the value of money then. The farms, plantations and estates generally, which were given or bequeathed for the use of the Pontiffs, and which carried with them the tillers and husbandmen attached to the soil, are computed by John the Deacon, in his Life of St. Gregory

1 In a pamphlet by Mgr. Schroeder, entitled American Catholics and the Roman Question.—Benziger Bros.

2 Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina, pars III, lib. I, c. 16, n. 5.

3 Gosselin, Power of the Pope, vol. I, Introduction, nn. 73, 74.

the Great, to have been in the time of that Pontiff, twenty-three "patrimonies"; nor did he include all in his calculation.[1] The Cottian Alps, comprising the city of Genoa and all the neighboring coasts to the frontiers of Gaul, were only one of these patrimonies. Others were distributed all over Italy. They were found in Sicily, Africa, Corsica, Gaul, Dalmatia. Those in Sicily and Calabria alone, which Leo the Isaurian confiscated, yielded an annual revenue of $80,000.

With these possessions there was connected a proportionate administration. Multitudes of clerics, of the poor, of widows and consecrated virgins were provided with temporal necessities from these resources. One item of St. Gregory's expenses was the support of 3,000 nuns to whom he gave annually a sum exceeding $15,000; and they needed it, if we may judge from his letter to the Princess Theoctista; for he speaks of nuns who had not wherewith to protect themselves "from the piercing cold" of the winter nights. Writing to the Empress Constantina, the same Pontiff mentions incidentally various heads of expense. "As in the territory of Ravenna, the solicitude of our masters has appointed a treasurer who provides the daily expenses to meet contingent needs, so in this city I am treasurer to meet the same needs. And yet this Church, which at one and the same time expends so much without intermission on clerics, monasteries, the poor, the people and on the Lombards besides, is moreover weighed down by the affliction of all the churches. . . ."

The title to all this property was that of ownership. It was a right vested in the Bishop, not held in the name of the State, or the Emperor of Constantinople; nor was it a trust held for the benefit of others, except in the sense that the Christian charity of the Bishop always regarded it as such,—a trust held in behalf of the poor and the suffering, of the orphan, the widow and the stranger, who were always at home under the shadow of God's Church, and had never to fear destitution as long as there was a chalice left to melt down into money for food. For they are in truth God's living temples, and their hearts are His altars, more so than the consecrated stones on the marble altars, and the pillars of onyx and candlesticks of massive silver and walls lined with purest gold, which reflected a thousand lights to the eyes of kneeling worshippers. This was the organization of Christian beneficence, without taxation; it was not sterile philanthropy, but Christ's own charity.

1 Brunengo, Origini della Sovranità Temporale dei Papi, Parte I. capo 2.

The very amplitude of such resources, dispensed in this manner, involved the Bishop in something like a civil administration. But there were many other circumstances, inseparable from his office, or at least inevitable in the condition of the times, which concurred to make a chief pastor nothing less than a civil magistrate. He became a judge in the fullest sense of that term. The very connection between things temporal and spiritual, the confidence of the people in the ecclesiastical authority and their profound reverence for his person, made him necessarily a referee ; but besides all that, the legal codes of the Valentinians, of Honorius, Theodosius the Younger and Justinian, invested him with the fullest judicial capacity ; and what these enactments established, the successors of Justinian amplified.[1] And, in the West this official competency of the Bishop, whether judicial or administrative, civil or military, advanced to a degree of almost unlimited control, according as the successes of barbarian invaders weakened ever more and more the bonds of political union between the West and Constantinople. In the light of this we can well understand St. Gregory's complaint, in a letter to the Bishop Sebastian : "At one and the same time to have charge of Bishops and clerics, of monasteries also and of the people at large, to keep a vigilant watch against the insidious attacks of the public enemy, to be always on the alert against the treachery and malice of the governors—what labor all this entails, and what pain it gives, your fraternal charity is the better qualified to divine, according as you bear a sincerer attachment to me who am the sufferer under these inflictions." [2]

In the eighth century of the Christian era the force of so many concurrent agencies, operating in the very nature of the political crises which arose fast and intense, pressed the Roman Pontiffs forward to the full exercise and possession of a Sovereign power. As Cantù expresses it, "If any hope of a resurrection, or at least of some relief, still remained to the Italians, there was no one on whom to rest such a hope except that Pontiff who, by his character, was called to be just and forbearing ; who still kept in honor among the nations that Roman name which on other accounts was held in contempt."[3] Governed by the Exarchs of Ravenna, in the name of the Greek Emperor, those parts of Italy, including the Roman "duchy," which still acknowledged their dependency on Constantinople, were made to feel their subjection in two very

1 Gosselin, Introduction, §§ v, vi.
2 Jungmann, Dissert. in Hist. Eccl. XIV. n. 11.
3 IV, 556.

sensitive ways ; first, in the wretchedness of a government which was utterly helpless against the attacks of the northern invaders ; secondly, in having to endure a tyrannical rule, which, in proportion to its helplessness without, signalized its power within by levying the heaviest taxes and drawing the last drop of blood still left in the hapless country. Not content with material oppression, the civil power invaded the most sacred rights of conscience. Nominally Catholic, orthodox, and most devoted children of the Church, the Greek Emperors then, like so many others of the same kind since, would fain dictate to the Popes doctrinal decrees and dogmatic formulas, order synods and prescribe canons, and force them to be accomplices and abettors in furthering all the novelties and heresies which took the fancy of the Emperors. Fortunately, when a bold warrior like Leo the Isaurian undertook to enforce his heresy with the edge of the sword, he was but helping to sever the last ties which kept the Roman Church in servitude. All Italy was up in arms, and the Pope alone kept them in their obedience. Hoping still for the conversion of the Emperor, he commanded the fidelity of the Italians to the cause of the true faith, but he bade them not to waver in their fidelity likewise to the Greek Empire.

If it were a people's choice that was to determine the complete emancipation of the Pope from any temporal jurisdiction, on whom was the choice of the Italian communities likely to fall, as between a Phocas and a St. Gregory the Great, between a Constans II and a St. Martin or Vitalian, between a Justinian II and St. Sergius, between a Leo the Isaurian or a Copronymus and Sts. Gregory II, Gregory III, Zachary and Paul I? However, it was not choice which settled the question of the Pope's temporal sovereignty. The willing consent of the populations concerned was not wanting ; and every legitimate title of cession, of donation, of restitution, was formulated in the final establishment of his power. But that which has a right to be considered his fundamental title to an independent sovereignty is that which alone escapes the free disposition of men, and is manifestly the work of Divine Providence in the order of the world—the imperative necessity of self-preservation, the temporal salvation of a people, and, in the instance before us, the salvation likewise of faith and morality in the face of devastating hordes, which, if not repelled, would have hurried all to a common grave, nor have come themselves to the knowledge of Christian faith, morality and civilization.

It was the era of the Lombards. They were a nation already largely Christian, but scarcely Catholic. For they had been anticipated in their belief by the frauds of Arianism. They had already laid a yoke of thirty-six "duchies," like a harness of iron, on the subjugated and despised Italians. Whole provinces were depopulated by the sword; and, though Rome was a territory exempt as yet from their rule, the Romans themselves were not exempt, any more than the rest of Italy, from the slaughter of nobles and priests, the sacking of churches and the destruction of cities. The Roman territory at this time coincided pretty closely with what has been known in our day as the Patrimony of St. Peter, along with a part of Umbria and the Campagna of Rome. After many perilous crises, finally, in the year 739, while the Iconoclast Emperor Leo was carrying on his war of heresy against the Roman Church, Luitprand, king of the Lombards, carried fire and sword into the imperial exarchate of Ravenna, ravaged the patrimonies of the Holy See in those parts, and then turned to Rome. Nothing was spared on his way. And on the 16th of June he laid siege to the eternal city.

A curious composition of humanity these Lombards were. The three kings who at this time figured successively on the stage of history, fulfilling in a remarkable way the designs of Providence with respect to the Roman See, were, we may take it, a fair specimen of the rest of their kin and clans. Paul the Deacon, himself a Lombard, describes Luitprand as a man of much wisdom, sagacious, very pious and a lover of peace; mighty in war, moderate, pure, modest and so forth; not ignorant of letters, but a bit of a philosopher, etc. No doubt he was so, as long as the fit was on him, and spells of a different kind did not control him. Indeed, the reverence and docility which these semi-barbarians showed to one Pontiff after another is one of the marvels of history. In the full career of victory, at the moment they were reaching the goal of a long-cherished ambition, we find men like Luitprand humbly sacrificing all, at the word of the Vicar of Christ, and that while actually besieging the same Vicar of Christ in his own city! Hence we may appreciate how sincerely happy was a barbarian like this, when, after taking dinner with Pope Zachary at Pavia, he expressed his lively sense of the Pontiff's sweetness, and the air of sanctity which surrounded everything, by saying that "he did not remember having eaten so much in his life before!"

His immediate successor Rachis was undoubtedly a valiant man,

as much so as Luitprand, but he was endowed with a genuine piety and mildness of disposition; and, on receiving a solemn legation from the Apostolic See, he signalized his love of peace by granting the Pope a peace of twenty years! All treaties of peace in those times regarded a limited time, and it was yet to be one of the achievements of the Bishops of the Church, by means of the pious and ingenious device of the "truce of God," to keep men from cutting one another's throats at least for a few days each week. But perhaps a twenty years' peace in those times was quite as long-lived as a "perpetual" one in these days of mildness and mutual benediction. In point of fact, this twenty-year peace lasted fully five years, and, after that long period of good behavior, we find him pouring his forces with great fury on the Roman territory. The saintly Pontiff Zachary went out to meet him at Perugia. The Roman forces were the same as usual; they consisted of the Pontiff's own personal sweetness, with the presence of some of his clergy, and considerable gifts. The immediate raising of the siege of Perugia was not the only effect of this interview. With the Pope's exhortations ringing in his ears, the good king a few days after abdicated his throne, and coming as a humble pilgrim to Rome, accompanied by his wife Tassia, and his daughter Ratrude, he begged the Pope to admit him into the ranks of the clergy. The Holy Father gave him the clerical tonsure and the Benedictine habit, and sent him to Monte Cassino, where Carloman, the eldest son of Charles Martel, was already a monk. Tassia and Ratrude became Benedictine nuns at Piumarola, not far from Cassino; no rare spectacle in those days, when, within the space of fifty years, England alone beheld five kings and one queen exchanging the crown of their own accord for a cowl or veil.

The successor of Rachis seems to have been a villain, if ever man was. This was Astulph, the brother of Rachis. He was astute and ferocious, yea, the most ferocious of even the Lombards; he was wicked, impious, atrocious; the like had never been seen in the days of even the Lombards. So the various historians of the time agree in describing him. It was fortunate for Europe that he was so, and that Pepin was the king of France at the same time. Things never went better than when they went so badly, God arranging all things for the good of His Church. But what was the end of this man, as soon as the excess of his wickedness had occasioned the inauguration of a new order of things, by the final and permanent establishment of the Temporal Power? Stricken by the

hand of God, "the first example," says Cesare Balbo, "of what we have often witnessed since, that whoever in Italy revolts against the Pope is not far from his fall."[1] Astulph died in the arms of monks, whom he had always loved and fostered much during life. Under the spur of an insatiable ambition he had indeed been carrying on wars to the last extremity of violence and brutality against the Pope, but at the same time he had been building churches and splendid monasteries; and, with a refinement of devotion, which must have been exquisite according to a barbarian's standard, he had robbed the churches which he was devastating round Rome of the bodies of the holy martyrs, but only to transport the sacred relics with every demonstration of honor to his new temples and altars at Pavia.[2] After all, it is quite conceivable that a passably honest barbarian, whose Christianity is just beginning to work outwardly from his heart, is as good as many an hereditary Christian whose religion, having exhausted itself within, is gradually disappearing without, like a fading complexion, the product of climate and environment. But to return to the order of events, as resulting in the establishment of the Papal Temporal Power.

At the time that Luitprand was beginning his career of conquest in the exarchate of Ravenna, and pushing on into Italy against Rome, Leo, the Isaurian, was carrying on his war of persecution against the Church. He sent a fleet against his own city of Ravenna which had rejected his impious heresy, and he "expropriated" the ancient patrimonies of the Holy See in Calabria and Sicily. This Emperor, as chief sovereign, was the natural protector of Rome. But, whereas his protectorate and that of his predecessors, had been distinguished for some centuries by a truly imperial freedom in the imposition of excessive taxes and an unremitting vigor in religious persecution, now, when the Lombard was at the gates of Rome, the natural protector kept at a safe distance, busily occupied in sacking churches and murdering Catholics.

Many a time before the Roman Pontiffs had faced the storms which swept over Italy, and had saved the relics of civilization from the swords of Huns, Goths and Vandals. But never before had the moral ascendency which alone they could employ been so utterly without temporal aid, as when the tempest burst upon Rome from the side of Luitprand the Lombard. Pope Gregory III. knew not whither to turn for protection; and therefore, looking beyond

1 Brunengo, Origini, parte I, c. 10.
2 Brunengo, Origini della Sovranità Temporale dei Papi, parte I, cc. 5-10.

the Alps, he appealed to Charles Martel. The French warrior's intervention seems to have turned Luitprand from his purpose, and Rome was left in peace. But the following year the exarchate of Ravenna, still belonging to the Greek Emperor, was again made the scene of the Lombard's depredations, and this time it was the Pope's intervention in behalf of the feeble province which saved it for the Court of Constantinople. The prestige of Rome was mounting high ; to friends and strangers alike His Holiness was the one arbiter of the fortunes of Italy. This was in 743. But in 751 the ferocious Astulph took possession of all the territory of Ravenna, captured the city itself, and put an end for ever to the dominion of Constantinople in northern Italy. Apparently neither the people of the conquered country thought it worth their while any longer to dispute who should be their masters, nor did the Emperor Copronymus seem to think the loss of the western province worth a moment's attention, his arms were too busy elsewhere propagating the iconoclastic heresy.

Now it was Rome's turn again to feel the invader's sword. But here the history of Pepin begins, like an epic at the opening of mediæval politics. We cannot follow him as he routs Astulph at Susa, and receives the pledges of his plighted faith under the walls of Pavia, nor pause to narrate how, when that faith was broken, and such scenes followed under the walls of Rome as make the blood run cold,[1] Pepin hurried once more over the Alps and brought the abject Astulph to terms. One thing only need be recorded, and that is the restoration of all properties to the Roman See, and the bestowal of the extinct exarchate of Ravenna on the Pontiff. Through the length and breadth of the exarchate, and of what was called the Pentapolis, Pepin received the formal and final surrender of every city ; and not one of them but was glad to be liberated for ever from all claims of the Greek empire over them and from the hated dominion of the Lombards. These Pepin conceded to Rome, because he considered they belonged to Rome. He "restored" them and all other properties, because as he said to the envoys of the Greek Emperor, he would be alienating them from St. Peter, if he acknowledged any other title to these domains. All were to remain under the exclusive and absolute temporal jurisdiction of Rome. And neither now, nor later when Charlemagne confirmed and enlarged the "donation," was there any reserve of power or jurisdiction to themselves, as if they were

1 Jungmann, Dissert. in Hist. Eccl., XIV, n. 55.

to be the suzerains of Rome. They were only its protectors, to be called on when the Pope thought fit. Thus every form of legality by public treaty was made to confirm the intrinsic legitimacy of the Papal Temporal Power. The city and its dependencies which had long been the Rome of the Popes, the "Sacred" Republic of the Romans, having for their legitimate prince, possessor and lord, St. Peter in his successors, now took a place of their own in the political relations of nations, just at the epoch when the nations were forming into that system of polity, known as modern Christendom.

The divine philosophy underlying all this is thus sketched by Bellarmine.[1] "Even if absolutely speaking it were perchance preferable that Pontiffs should manage only spiritual things, and kings temporal affairs, still, on account of the wickedness of the times, experience openly proclaims that it was not only useful but necessary, in the divine arrangement of Providence, that some temporal principalities should be conferred on the Pope and other Bishops. For, if in Germany, Bishops had not been princes, there had been no Bishop remaining in his See to our day. As therefore in the Old Testament there were for a long time Pontiffs who wielded no temporal power, and yet in the later ages religion could no longer maintain itself and be defended, unless the Pontiffs were also kings, viz., in the time of the Macchabees; in like manner we see in the affairs of the Church, that whereas in the first ages she did not need a temporal principality to defend her majesty, now she seems to require it as a necessity." It was the difference between a state of infancy and adult age; between her being in an environment of political government, whereof she could not be a part, though she was in it, and being in quite another environment, which could not do without her as an integral part of Christian polity, and as the vivifying centre of law, morality and national life.

From that time to this, in the enjoyment of an imprescriptible right and with accessions, neither slight nor dubious, made to their possessions by various Catholic Emperors and by the Countess Matilda, the Popes have presided over the moral welfare of Christendom, and in particular, have made and preserved the fortune and heritage of Italy. If Cantù speaks of their "having hampered the political development of the peninsula," he may have in mind those material interests which, broadly speaking, can be classed under the general head of the accumulation of mammon—an accumulation which we observe has taken place in a superlative degree

1 De Rom. Pontifice, lib. V, c. 9.

precisely there, where faith in the supernatural has been paralyzed by heresy, where morality has declined more rapidly than faith, and where misery and pauperism abound exactly in proportion to the apoplectic fulness of wealth. But, if the prime element in the political development of a people is social happiness as bound up with faith and morality, we find that the fortunes of Italy have been in the ascendant according as the Roman Pontiff has been in honor and power. Any other conception of the political well-being of Italy rests either on some gratuitous and revolutionary theory about the "rights of man," or as far as it emphasizes some special inabilities as to constitutional change, the true conception of Italy's highest welfare was long ago expressed by M. Thiers in these terms: "This interest" he said, speaking of the Pope's Temporal Power, "is one of a superior order, which should overrule inferior interests, as, in a state, the public interest silences individual interests." [1] This is an elementary principle which has been applied, not only by Europe in neutralizing certain nations like Belgium or Switzerland, or in closing the Dardanelles, but also by the United States of America in practically disfranchising the District of Columbia, as being the honored seat of a higher government.

The story of Italy's prosperity or adversity as varying with the fortunes of the Roman Pontiffs, would form an apt commentary on this philosophical conception of the country's history. And at the present moment when the Pope's rights are forcibly withheld from him, a primacy has indeed been attained by the "constitutional" policy which is in control of the peninsula. It is such a primacy as has nothing to equal it in the whole extent of Europe, but it is not exactly in the line of civilization and wealth. No, it is portentously in the line of taxes and debts, of financial depression and official tyranny, of destitution, depopulating a flourishing land and, moreover, of deeds of blood and social vices, all of which seem to be the distinguishing characteristics or results of God's vengeance for a great national sin. [2]

THOMAS HUGHES, S. J.

1 Dupanloup, the Papal Sovereignty, ch. 4, §3.

2 Consult the *Civiltà Cattolica* Jan. 16, Feb. 7, 1892, L'Italia dopo trent' anni di Rivoluzione.

## CLERICAL STUDIES.

### SEVENTH ARTICLE.

### PHILOSOPHY. (CONCLUSIONS.)

UNDER the title, *De Varia Aristotelis Fortuna* an old Gallican Doctor of Sorbonne, named Launoy, gave, better than two hundred years ago, a history, still read with interest, of the vicissitudes through which the works of Aristotle had passed during the Middle Ages. The scholastic Philosophy, so closely wedded to that of Aristotle, shared largely, as we have seen, its varying fortunes. In our day we witness its recovery from the almost total neglect in which it had lain for a whole century. But the length and vigor of its new life must depend in a great measure on the manner in which it is henceforth set before the public mind and imparted to the new generations which come up in succession for philosophical training.

We propose in the present paper to state our personal conceptions of what that training should be. We do so with a hope that, though many of our remarks may be already familiar to the reader, it will still be useful to express and to emphasize them. They will bear principally on three things :

The ends to be kept in view ;

The practical difficulties to be encountered ;

The special requirements of each one of the branches of a philosophical course.

#### I.

Philosophy may be studied for a variety of purposes. All are not equally important, nor can all be fully compassed within the time usually allotted to such studies. It becomes consequently a duty for the teacher to ask himself at the outset, and to keep the question steadily before him : How can I be most serviceable to those whom it is my duty to teach ? What questions, what methods, what mental discipline will best fit them for the work of life as a whole ?

1. The first object of a course of Philosophy is *knowledge—technical knowledge*. Philosophy, like all other sciences, means a body of notions, facts, problems, theories, doctrines, demonstrations. To become acquainted with at least what is principal in all these ; to

have realized their true meaning, their mutual connection, their bearing on the most important issues of thought and life, is the direct and immediate object of systematic philosophical studies. Of this knowledge, as the necessary crowning of a liberal education, and as a necessary introduction to the study of Theology, enough has already been said in a previous article.

2. The second object is *mental discipline*. All methodic teaching trains the mind, but such training is one of the main purposes of a course of Philosophy.

The untrained mind is inaccurate: outside the commonest subjects it is easily darkened and confused. It stops at the surface of things; it fails to see into their depths, to catch their connection. It grasps but feebly the higher objects of thought, and is an easy prey to sophism. To correct these deficiencies, nothing can compare with philosophical training, intelligently pursued. Thus, by the constant use of rigorous definitions, it compels the mind to distinctness of conception and accuracy of statement, a schooling of the mind begun, it is true, much earlier, since all real knowledge, nay, all use of words, implies something of it. It is, in fact, one of the principal advantages to be found in the translation of ancient languages, a process implying a clear discernment of the different shades of thought and of the corresponding propriety of words.

But such exercise, however valuable in the hands of an intelligent teacher of Greek or Latin, lead to no scientific distinction, and apply much more to the things of life than to those of abstract thought. Hence, the vagueness and confusion so noticeable in the ordinary student who takes up for the first time any philosophical subject.

The same may be said of all the other familiar processes of philosophical studies. To divide and classify properly requires the most close attention and careful analysis. To build up an argument, or even to realize its value, brings into play the faculties of abstraction and comparison. To follow out a series of deductions accustoms the mind to grasp and hold simultaneously many thoughts together. The daily thoughtful handling of books, ancient and modern, educates of itself in that direction.

To say nothing of others, Aristotle, the great master of definitions and distinctions, Plato reflecting in his dialogues the questioning mind of Socrates and ever striving to get at the meaning of terms, can hardly be touched without imparting something of their nicety and depth of discernment.

The third object of philosophical training is the development of *mental power*. It is meant to broaden the mind and enable it to take in the manifold aspects of things. It is meant to give depth of thought, to accustom the student to go to the very heart and root of things, to seek for and to find the underlying principle, the ultimate reason beyond which the mind feels neither the need nor the power to go. It is meant more still to impart that *strength of intellect* by which men test and try whatever comes up before them, to weigh the value of each statement, of each proof, to verify principles and facts, admitting, rejecting or doubting, according to the amount and value of proof supplied. Finally it goes to form that healthy condition of mind known under the name of vigorous *common sense*—a quickness to distinguish shams from realities, sound from sophistical argument, to take a steady view of things, to get a solid grasp of truth not to be easily shaken by unintellectual influences from within or from without.

Knowledge, discipline, power, such then are the main objects to be kept in view by teachers and students, by the former especially, whose duty it is to determine the methods and exercises by which they may be most effectively attained. The task is no small one; in fact it is beset with difficulties. The principal of these it may be well to consider here, as on the manner of dealing with them the final result must entirely depend.

II.

1. The first difficulty the professor of Philosophy has to contend with is the unphilosophical cast of mind of some of his pupils. For, amongst those who may fairly aspire to a professional career, or to the priesthood, it is not at all unusual to find young men entirely unfitted for the ordinary exercises of the scholastic discipline. They are by no means devoid of intelligence; they have derived a fair share of benefit from their previous liberal training; they are sensible, shrewd; but speculation and formal argument are entirely beyond them. Theirs is a sort of intuitive Philosophy. They see, but they cannot deduct or formulate. They are and perhaps will always remain, incapable of constructing a syllogism, but they somehow reach the right conclusions as often as others. They cannot tell you just where the fallacy lies in an unsound argument, but instinctively they feel it is there, and are not deceived by it. Do not expect from them the ordinary definitions and classifications of the human faculties, unless they speak from memory; but their

knowledge of character may be equal to the best. Abstract principles seem to be beyond them, yet the correctness with which they judge the things of life would prove that such principles are in some manner present to their minds.

Such as they are, not much philosophical knowledge can be imparted to them. The elementary notions, a statement of the essential doctrines and proofs, is about all they can be expected to understand or to remember. To strive for more in that direction is only a waste of time and labor. But much more may be done to discipline and strengthen such minds, either by eliciting personal effort in what they can compass, or merely by having them watch attentively the training of others, this being about the most improving part of their discipline.

2. A second difficulty, of the most serious kind and common to all beginners, arises from the utter strangeness of the new field that is opened to their activity. In their previous studies, there was an even, steady advance from what was familiar to what was unknown. Each new form of knowledge began by what was most accessible, and the mind was led on by easy steps to what was most complex and highest, whilst the whole work was done through the medium of the native tongue, and of a vocabulary easily mastered.

But for a beginner in scholastic Philosophy, all these facilities are missing. All is new and difficult—the notions, the terms, the methods and the language. He is suddenly introduced into a world of abstract ideas hitherto unknown. And then Latin, as a vehicle of thought, is unfamiliar to him. Even the old, well known truths assume strange, and, to him, unnatural forms, whilst the terminology of the schools is obscure and bewildering. He is soon lost, as in a fog, and if he continues to grope his way through the darkness, it is only because he is encouraged by the voice of his teacher and occasionally cheered by glimmerings of brightness from beyond which tell him of the region of light to which he is being led. Some never emerge from the gloom, and even those who do, always remember it as the most trying period of their intellectual formation. Too often the teacher, to whom all has become familiar, fails to realize this condition of things, and proceeds serenely on his way, forgetting how hard it is to follow him. Yet his plain duty is to measure accurately each one of those accumulated obstacles and to do what may be done to remove them.

*1st.*—As regards the concepts of Philosophy, it is clear that the

mind of the student has to be led on, as in mathematics and in every other department of knowledge, from what is simple and accessible to what is farther removed from ordinary conceptions; from the concrete to the abstract, from the familiar facts of psychological experience to the higher laws and principles of thought. In this way he feels from the beginning the solid ground under his feet; he can retrace his steps to the starting point at any time, and, at every stage of his course, he knows exactly where he stands and whither he moves. For this reason, among others, experimental psychology should come first in philosophical study. It is of easy access, attractive, and it prepares the mind naturally and logically for all that follows.

*2d.*—This leads us to another remark relative to the *subtleties and refinements of the schools* on which so much time and intellectual power were frittered away during the Middle Ages. Although the scholastic Philosophy was confessedly encumbered and weakened by them, an attempt is positively made in our day to bring them back again. Ardent inquirers into the older Philosophy having been led to study them, gradually have come to enjoy them, and now they would persuade the world at large to share the enjoyment. That such nice discriminations and dissections of thought are generally groundless or valueless, we would by no means imply; that in the discussion of many curious and, for the modern mind, silly questions, a wonderful sagacity and penetration have been exhibited, no reader of the schoolmen will be tempted to question; that even an acquaintance with all this is necessary for a thorough knowledge of mediæval Philosophy, we freely admit. But there it should rest. It has little or no business in our text books for beginners. They are too busy; too many objects, solid and important, claim their attention to leave room for so much that was of interest to other ages. The numberless possible forms of the syllogism, the various degrees of the *materia prima*, the entities, entelechics and quiddities in which our forefathers reveled and lost themselves, may have been very well in their day, but their interest henceforth must remain largely of a purely historical and archæological kind.[1]

1. It will be remembered how keenly it was felt, even as early as the XVIth century, that the subtleties referred to above were a subject of reproach to the schools, and would have to be thrown overboard in order to save the cargo. The following passage from the celebrated work of Melchior Cano (de locis theol., lib. IX, c. 7), though somewhat radical, will prove interesting and probably comforting in its admissions to more than one of our readers: "Nostri autem Theologi, importunis vel locis, longa de his oratione disserunt quae nec juvenes portare possunt, nec senes ferre. Quis enim ferre possit disputationes de universalibus, de nominum analogia, de primo cognito, de principio individuationis

*3d.*—The benificent excision of such excrescences, whilst relieving scholastic Philosophy from a reproach not unmerited in the past, will remedy in some measure the inconvenience arising from the use of the *scholastic vocabulary*, but enough still remains to create a serious difficulty. To understand it, we have only to remember that among the causes which contributed most to the diffusion of the Cartesian Philosophy was the fact that its author and followers took up and dealt with the highest questions in the language of every-day life. All technical terms were discarded, so that educated persons could, without any special training, follow the developments and discussions to which the new system gave birth. Since then Philosophy has ceased to be scholastic in the original sense of the word ; that is, confined to the schools. In its various shapes it has gone abroad and impressed itself on the literature of the day. It has formed the conceptions and the language of society, and thus already has been taught in some manner to those who have not yet entered on its technical study. Now this study, when pursued on the lines of scholasticism, introduces them, not only to objects entirely new, but to a new conception of things already familiar. Thus the intellectual processes are differently analyzed and described, the powers of the soul distinguished and classified after a different plan. Again, the old terms of the school which had fallen into disuse, brought into prominence anew, convey at first no distinct meaning; some of them, expressive of conceptions foreign to the modern mind, have no equivalents in our language, and are spoken of only in their original Latin form. Others, such as *Matter*, *Form*, *Cause*, *Motion*, *Accident*, etc., are taken in a technical sense more or less at variance with their ordinary meaning. Hence that painful condition of obscurity and confusion so common in beginners, and lasting unhappily in some to the very end. The teacher cannot be too much concerned to dispel it as speedily and as thoroughly as possible. No real work is done as long as it lasts. The student commits to memory and recites, when required, a set form of words, definitions, theses, proofs ; he

(sic enim inscribunt), de distinctione quantitatis a re quanta, de maximo et minimo, de intensione et remissione . . . . deque aliis hujusmodi sexcentis, quae ego etiam, cum nec essem ingenio nimis tardo, nec his intelligendis parum temporis et diligentiae adhibuissem, animo vel informare non poteram ? Puderet me dicere non intelligere, si ipsi intelligerent qui haec tractarunt. Quid vero illas quaestiones nunc referamus ? Num Deus materiam possit facere sine forma, num plures angelos ejusdem speciei condere, num continuum in omnes suas partes dividere, num relationem a subjecto separare, aliasque multo vaniores quas scribere hic nec libet, nec decet, ne qui in hunc forte 'ocum inciderint, ex quorumdam ingenio omnes scholæ auctores aestiment."

answers objections in the prescribed form, but with only the haziest notions of what it is all about. Ask him to state the same things in other terms, or to put in plain English what he so glibly throws off in Latin; he is powerless to do it. Clearly he knows nothing, and is learning nothing but words.

*4th.*—The evil is far from being lessened by the *Use of Latin*, as the medium of philosophical instruction. No language, it is true, is better fitted for the expression of any Philosophy than that in which it developed originally and reached its perfection, and if the student's knowledge was to be strictly confined to mediæval Philosophy, and if the Latin tongue was familiar to him, there would be no reason to go outside it. But neither supposition corresponds to the facts. It is well known that most aspirants to the priesthood in this country enter the Philosophy course with far less knowledge of Latin than is found elsewhere in students similarly situated. And then they come to learn, not only what was thought in past ages, but also what modern investigation has added to the treasure of philosophical knowledge, and even the courses which men's minds have followed when they wandered from the truth, for how else can they be won back to it?

We may be permitted in this connection to repeat what was written several years ago by Dr. Kavanagh, senator of the Royal Irish University (Study of Mental Philosophy). "Shall Catholic teaching be confined exclusively to scholastic Philosophy in its ancient forms, or shall the Professors of Philosophy in Catholic Colleges be required to expand and develop the principles of St. Thomas, and apply them to the wants of modern discussion? Shall we ignore the living present, and direct our teaching exclusively to the dead past? Shall we teach our students to refute errors unheard of for centuries, except in scholastic disputations, and to ignore errors which are in active operation around us and are eating into the very vitals of Christian faith and Christian moral teaching? For the answer to this question, I appeal to St. Thomas himself, ever busy with the errors of his day, and to our Holy Father, Leo XIII. . . . . To me it would seem more rational to strike out of the curriculum all the discoveries of science since the days of Descartes, than all the developments of Philosophy since the days of St. Thomas. A Catholic gentleman can get on fairly without a knowledge of higher Mathematics, as of the recent advances in Physical Science; but how can he mix in society without peril to his faith,

if he is ignorant of the facts and views of modern Philosophy which are discussed at every dinner table? . . . . In England, Philosophy is a favorite study with the educated classes, and no one can share in their discussions who is not familiar with its more prominent systems and has not mastered the questions which divide the various schools. If then Philosophy is taught at all, it should not be taught exclusively in a language unintelligible, except to the disciples of a particular school. . . . . We must not send the young Catholic into society to do battle for his faith, to unmask error and to defend truth, using a language which would require an interpreter, and trained only on a system which unfits him to take part in modern intellectual conflicts."

All this is, to say the least, as true of aspirants to the priesthood in this country as of the young Catholic laity of Europe. It entails on the professor of Philosophy an arduous task.

He has, in the first place, to translate for his pupils all that is new or unusual in the conceptions or vocabulary of the schools into the language of ordinary thought. He can be sure to reach the minds of many of them only through the medium of their mother tongue. Text books, recitations, occasional essays, all in Latin, are a practical necessity in view of the subsequent study of Theology and of the important place which the Latin language occupies in the intellectual and devotional life of a priest. But it has been the experience of the writer for many years that, of those who have been taught Philosophy, and especially scholastic Philosophy, only in Latin, not more than one in half a dozen had brought away with him much more than a set of formulas, with only a very imperfect notion of their meaning, though not unfrequently accompanied by a strong determination to cling to them all, indiscriminately and at any cost.

Hence the most experienced professors, whilst using Latin as the ordinary vehicle of their teaching, do not fail, in their classes or in private conference, to appeal to the vernacular whenever it is necessary to convey the full and true meaning of things to the minds of their hearers. To the student himself, nothing of what he learns is of any value unless he is thus taught to realize it and make it his own. Thus only will it help him to further truth, or will he be able to speak of it in an easy, intelligible manner, and with that completeness and naturalness of conviction with which he speaks of any ordinary matter. Short of this, he will be afraid to wander beyond the limits of the technical phraseology which he has learnt,

and a stiff, awkward, dogmatism will take the place of a living and communicative conviction.[1]

*5th.*—But such a discipline, it will be said, bringing home to the mind of the student every notion and every truth, requires more time than is practically available. Why then recommend it?

This brings us to the last, but not the least, of the many difficulties which a professor of Philosophy has to contend with.

The fact upon which it rests is unquestionable. It is with the mind as with the body. Just as some forms of nutriment are promptly absorbed into the system, whilst others are of slow assimilation, so certain forms of knowledge can be acquired continuously and rapidly, whilst for others more time is essential. Literature, Art, Philosophy belong to the latter class. They can not be taught or learned at the same time quickly and effectively. Like the beneficent rain, they need to fall on the mind softly and gently in order to sink into its depths. An able professor can deal with most questions of Philosophy in a single year's course, and his work, if he gives it to the public, will read well. But if you look for it in the minds of his auditors, what remains? Definitions, statements, proofs, committed to memory, and still retained, perhaps, but how little realized? The conscious growth of power, the mental elation, the craving for more, which invariably follow on all genuine increase of knowledge, are painfully absent, except from a few. In other words, a full course of Philosophy, such as it is generally understood, especially when combined with other important matters of study, cannot be given with advantage in a single academic year. Either it has to be limited in matter or extended in time. Even though, by increasing the number of classes, the whole ground may be covered, the other ends above mentioned—discipline and power—are necessarily lost sight of.

And yet they are more essential than mere knowledge, because through them the best sort of knowledge becomes accessible, and, in a measure far beyond, and of a kind far above, what comes by mere teaching. In fact when the time is so inadequate to all purposes, the best method would, perhaps, be to consider Philosophy principally as a means of mental discipline and mental vigor. In this way the professor would be less concerned to introduce his

1 In this connection, the Stonyhurst Series: Manuals of Catholic Philosophy, recently published in English, will be found very serviceable to professors and students. We would also mention an Elementary Philosophy, by Mr. James Wilcox, of Philadelphia, which seems to be less known than it deserves.

auditors to a large number of questions, than to fit them to understand and to be interested in all.

That abiding interest in philosophical questions is one of the most valuable results of a judicious training, and it can be secured far better by an occasional momentary lifting of the veil, giving an impression of the vast extent and beauty of what lies beyond, than by rushing right through it all, and reaching the end with a notion that all has been seen. A student, unless devoid of the philosophical faculty, who cares not to go back and look more intently and see more, gives proof that he has seen very little indeed, it may be because little has been rightly shown him.

## III.

The views which we have expressed in these pages apply to every part of a philosophical course. Each principal section would require to be considered at length, but here we have room only for a few general observations.

*1st.—Experimental psychology*, as already remarked, we consider the best to begin with. As a distinct branch of the science, it has grown rapidly within the last century in interest and popularity. Its most recent developments in connection with physiology have made it one of the most engrossing subjects of the day. Its data, old and new, are the starting point of some of the gravest problems of mind and life. Yet, strange to say, in most of our scholastic manuals, it obtains only the faintest recognition, appearing, if at all, only for a moment and in its antiquated form and garb. The student lays down the book knowing nothing of the human soul, its powers, its laws, its mechanism and working, nothing of the action, normal and abnormal, on it of the nervous system, beyond what any one may know without special study. Surely there is here a considerable lacuna which demands imperatively to be filled by author or professor.

*2d.—Logic* comes next. Properly taught, it is a splendid training school for the mind, and can be made as interesting and enjoyable as it is too often disheartening and dreary. The operations of the mind are, after all, not difficult to understand, and the forms and laws of argument, whilst offering in their endless varieties a very healthy exercise for the mind, if time could be spared for them, may be indefinitely shortened and simplified with little positive inconvenience.

There are two other exercises on which the time commonly given them would be better spent. The first is the practice of analysis, by which students might be required to take up a page, carefully selected, and point out the statements and arguments which it contains; the statements to be set forth separately, the arguments reduced to syllogistic form by expressing the implied premises. The second is a critical dissection of some chapter of book or passage of discourse, in which a weak or sophistical line of argument would have to be detected and refuted. The time-honored Disputations should not be put aside, but they require a judicious guidance, much drilling, and are really accessible only to a chosen few.

All these exercises accustom the mind to close attention, to reflection, to accurate thought. They give a growing sense of power which leads on of itself to greater efforts.

*3d.* A new branch of study, often connected with logic in the early part of the century, deals with the groundwork and laws of *Human certitude.* In the general healthy condition of mind during the Middle Ages, it was little needed, but its importance in a period, such as the present, of widespread scepticism, can scarcely be exaggerated. On all sides we meet men highly gifted, yet unsettled in almost all their convictions "knowing everything," as has been said of them, "and believing nothing." It is part of the sacerdotal calling to bring them back to natural as well as to supernatural belief. But the disease is hard to cure, and it is contagious. The matter consequently requires to be handled with great caution and tact. We must confine ourselves here to observe briefly. *a.* That far from allowing the basis of certitude to be narrowed, as was done by Descartes, Kant and so many others, it should be maintained, in conformity with the wisest schools of Philosophy ancient and modern, on the broad foundation on which nature herself has placed it. *b.* This is the only service that Philosophy can render in such matters, for neither the system of Aristotle nor any other can add to the natural, primitive, indestructible fact of human trust in the human faculties. *c.* Certitude is strengthened in all, but especially in young men by habitual contact with those whose minds dwell in the regions of serene conviction. St. Thomas is admirable in this regard. He works his way through the most intricate questions with the same security as a mathematician works out a problem. One feels that he walks in the light.[1]

1 A homage of a more general kind to the Angelic Doctor from the pen of a Protestant bishop will be welcome to our readers. "If penetration of thought, comprehension of

*d.*—To be too trustful is as perilous to certitude as to be too diffident. To find weakness where none was originally suspected produces a reaction leading to the opposite extreme. The mind is best balanced when it recognizes the true value of the grounds upon which theories and systems are built.

*4th.*—Of *metaphysics*, still more than of the other branches, there is so much to say that a whole article would scarcely suffice to convey it. We must confine ourselves here to respectfully recommend, first, that the section of ontology, or *general metaphysics*, should not be made unnecessarily obscure or dry. It need not be either. It is not desirable that everything should be made easy, or dropped where it becomes difficult. The very difficulties become positively attractive and exciting when the mind is properly led up to them.

Secondly, that in view of the modern condition of minds, the section of natural Theology, especially the proofs of the existence of God, should be developed as fully as possible.

Thirdly, that in consideration of the universal prevalence of the inductive methods, they should be freely employed by the professor to establish the necessary principles of demonstration when not self-evident. A happy illustration of this will be found in an article of Rev. J. Vaughan, of the Existence of God, in the Dublin *Review*, of January, 1892.

*5th.*—The course of ethics has to be drawn out for clerical students with a constant reference to their subsequent studies of Moral Theology. There are several fundamental questions, purely philosophical, which have assumed such importance in our day and in this country that they have to be dealt with thoroughly at some time or another.

*6th.*—We will conclude by observing that our age being both literary and historical, the philosophical training of our clerical youth, to be practical and effective, should share in that twofold character. They should be taught not only to think, but to give a free, forcible and happy expression to their thoughts. The success of Platonism, Cartesianism, Malebranchism, in the past, of all forms

views, exactness the most minute, an ardor of inquiry the most keen, a patience of pursuit the most unwearied are among the merits of the philosopher, then may Aquinas dispute the first place among the candidates for the supremacy in speculative science. Dr. Hampden, Bishop of Hereford, England, art. Thomas Aquinas in the Metropolitan Cyclopædia.

of agnosticism in the present, has been and is largely due to the literary ability of their supporters.

Finally, as far as time permits, the theories, systems and truths taught should be exhibited to students not in abstract isolation, but as they emerged from the minds of men and developed and spread in the course of ages. It is only by this living presentation of them that they can be clearly understood.[1]

A thorough knowledge of the history of ideas is essential to the professor. He has to make himself familiar with the great originators of thought, Plato, Aristotle, S. Augustine, S. Thomas, Bacon, Descartes, etc., as well as with the vicissitudes of their systems. In possession of this knowledge, he will find it both easy and helpful to introduce it into his teaching and still more to show his hearers the bearing of ancient abstract speculations on the living issues of the day. It would be desirable, and we believe possible, that students themselves should go back occasionally to the sources. One of Aristotle's shorter treatises, a few dialogues of Plato, something of the mediæval, modern, and contemporary writers, would give them a more vivid sense than aught else of the true meaning and spirit of philosophical systems and be a powerful inducement to pursue in after-life studies thus made attractive from the beginning, and sure to prove elevating and strengthening to the end.

J. HOGAN.

---

## OUR FAIR LADY'S UNIFORM.

THERE is no instinct in the human heart which the Catholic religion does not convert into nobler aspirations than those which earth can supply. Every one understands why the soldier is proud of the ensign which betokens his military rank, why the statesman displays his ribbon, or the collegian the medal of his graduation. These things derive worth, not from their intrinsic value nor simply as being rewards of victory and honorable achievment, but much more because they supply the wearer with an ideal ;

1 Abbe Vallet whose *Manual of Scholastic Philosophy*, specially recommended by Leo XIII, has become the most popular book of the kind in France, gives in his *History of Philosophy* a very full and interesting account of scholasticism. Stoeckl's History is also very valuable. Paul Yanet has recently given to the public a most useful volume in which the history of each subject is pursued separately and consecutively. It is in this form that the history of Philosophy is most helpful to students.

because they bind him to a purpose which has its sanction from a source far above his own conscious sense of merit.

Such is the meaning of a badge or medal in Catholic devotions. As the soldier proclaims silently his allegiance to the sovereign, the uniform of whose service he wears, as the student recognizes in his badge of honor a pledge which binds him to the ideals placed before him in his Alma Mater, so the Catholic who wears a medal of our Blessed Lady, not only attests thereby his willing allegiance to the principles of the Catholic faith, but he emphasizes his admiration of the high ideal which this token represents, and with it he expresses silently, but constantly, his wish to imitate, as far as may be, the noble qualities which raised the modest Virgin of Nazareth to the high dignity of Mother of our Redeemer. To youth and maiden, to spouse and parent the ideal of the Immaculate Mother of Christ appeals alike with ennobling tendency.

With a similar, only a more emphatic purpose do Catholics don the Scapular of our Blessed Lady. It is an ensign which stands for the uniform chosen by the legions of the fair Queen of heaven whom all Christians love to serve and honor, because she is the Blessed Mother of our Saviour. This fact cannot be sufficiently dwelt upon, because it is often lost sight of; for external habits of devotion may become mechanical, and in a case like the present they foster a sort of superstition which is as unwholesome to the soul as it is unreasonable.

When, some years ago, the Holy See announced that it would be requisite hereafter to inscribe in the registers of the different confraternities, the names of those who are invested with the Scapulars, the restriction aroused in many, even of the clergy, a sense of uneasiness as though this new measure would result in a loss of good to the faithful generally. Yet there was a strong reason for the restriction which was likely to produce greater good in the end. The universal custom of wearing the Scapulars had made it, in many cases, a mere perfunctory and outward act of devotion. Some looked upon the little garment as a sort of charm which would ward off all manner of ills irrespective of the disposition and moral life of the wearer. This view is apt to foster superstition rather than devotion. In reality the Scapulars represent a religious dress; those who assume it become affiliated to a religious order; and whilst they participate in the spiritual advantages and privileges of this community of which they become members, it is but just that their initiation, equivalent to a religious profession, should be marked by some solemnity or formality, and their names be duly enrolled in

the catalogue of the order. In this way the obligations implied by the assumption of the Scapular are emphasized and apt to become more fruitful by influencing the practical life of each member. Even though the mere assumption of the Scapular implies veneration for and a desire to cultivate the high ideal represented by it, which thus becomes a source of grace and protection in spite of our frailty, yet it is nevertheless true that "the dress does not make the monk." The neglect to inscribe the names may lessen the number of those who participate in the good work of the religious communities represented by the various Scapulars, but the obligation of doing so intensifies, on the other hand, the intelligent devotion of those who, going to the trouble of a formality which is entirely reasonable and just, realize the duty which they assume thereby and lead more worthy Christian lives.

But, whilst it is of the nature of every reform that it causes many to fall off because the zeal of the few serves as a chastisement to their indolence, the ingenious mercy of God ever invents new ways of drawing within its circle the weak and the slow. Every new devotion or old devotions newly revived seem to imply a wider concession to human frailty. Such it appears to us, is the devotion of the *Blue Scapular*, which for several reasons recommends itself to Catholics at this time, and to American Catholics in particular.

## The Blue Scapular.

Among the different Scapulars in use, is that of the Immaculate Conception, commonly called the Blue Scapular. Up to recent years, few, except pilgrims to Lourdes and the members of the Theatine Order had devoted themselves to its special propagation.[1]

It is noteworthy that the Blue Scapular does not represent any religious order and hence *does not require that the names of those who are invested with it, be inscribed in any register.* The Superior of the Theatines in Rome has the primary faculty of blessing these Scapulars and of delegating others to do so. Some of our Bishops, we understand, have received the same faculty from the Propaganda.

## Origin of the Blue Scapular.

In 1583 Ursula Benincasa, the daughter of an old Neapolitan family formed a society composed of devout maidens whose object

1 The fact that there were zealous hearts at work in our own midst in behalf of this beautiful devotion, was brought to our immediate attention through a paper which appeared in a recent number of the *Ave Maria* entitled "A Devotion for American Catholics." (March 5, 1892.)

was to lead a life of purity, prayer, labor and charity, in close imitation of the life of the Blessed Mother of Christ. The number of associates was originally limited to 66 in honor of the years which, according to Catholic tradition, the Blessed Virgin Mary spent on earth. Later another similar institute was formed under the title of "Immacolata" which allowed affiliation of lay persons. These religious wore a white woolen dress, blue Scapulars and blue mantle. The community was placed under the direction of the Theatine Fathers who still retain its patronage, although the order founded by the devout Ursula has, as a religious community, ceased to exist. Her beautiful example, her broad charity and generous spirit of self-sacrifice had given her a wonderful influence over all classes of people, and utilizing, for the honor and glory of God, this admiration of her personal gifts, she led the willing crowds who sought her intercession, to follow the path of virtuous living by giving them a memento—a pledge of affiliation and fidelity, in the small token of a Blue Scapular which they were to wear night and day as reminders of purity, charity and self sacrifice. This is the origin of the Blue Scapular.

The death of this holy woman occurred in 1618. So great was the reputation for sanctity and the power for good which she had among her countrymen that when it was rumored that she was going to die, the leading citizens of Naples assembled around her bed making a solemn request that she would continue in heaven the patronage which she had exercised in their midst during life for the reform of morals and the cultivation of public and private virtue.[1]

## General and Special Object of the Devotion.

The general objects which the wearers of the Blue Scapular have in view are:

I. To honor the Blessed Mother of Christ, in her special prerogative of the Immaculate Conception, by purity of life and the cultivation of other Christian virtues expressed in the model of womanhood.

II. To pray and labor for the conversion of those in error and sin.

When we apply the purpose which the saintly Ursula had proposed to herself in establishing the devotion of the Blue Scapular, to our conditions and country, there seems to be in it a particular

1 The process of her canonization was inaugurated under Pius VI, by a decree dated Aug. 7, 1793. Clement X, by Brief of Jan. 30, 1671, Clement XI, by Brief of May 12, 1710, and Pius IX, by Rescript, Sept. 19, 1851, have sanctioned the devotion of the Blue Scapular as originated by the Venerable Ursula Benincasa.

aptitude and a separate appeal for its cultivation among American Catholics.

The United States have been placed under the special Protectorate of the Immaculate Queen of heaven. The title of Immaculate Conception is a national one, in the religious sense of the word. As clients of this august Patroness it is most fitting that we should don the uniform which is used in a special way to designate the members of the militia of our heavenly Protectress. That there is a warfare impending which demands our united efforts, no one who marks the signs of the times can doubt. Indeed, there are many dangers actually present and at work in our midst. The writer in the *Ave Maria*, to whom we referred above, points this out in the following words:

> The dangers that threaten our country are insidious and powerful. True religion and Catholic morality are held and observed by only a small proportion of its inhabitants—one-sixth at the largest showing. Moreover the air is full of evil influences tending to undermine them,—moral evils which assail us all, and errors in doctrine to which five-sixths of the people are a prey, and which are not without peril even to the faithful. We have but to name a few of these evils to appreciate their danger: Intemperance, divorce, political corruption and business dishonesty, social evils, pauperism and crime, godless education, infidel literature, agnosticism and heresies, worldliness and greed of riches, enmities and strife between capital and labor, speculation, gambling and extravagance. There are, besides, dangers arising from conditions unfavorable to the growth of traditions of piety and purity,—conditions brought on by constantly shifting populations, indiscriminate immigration, and the necessity of letting our young people drift out into the world alone and unprotected to seek their fortunes. Many of these evils we share in common with all peoples, but many arise from our peculiar circumstances and temptations. They are American evils, or at least are felt here with exceptional force.

Blue is the color of our national army. It won the victory for freedom in behalf of an enslaved race. Although we are not fighting "the gray," who are our brothers in this warfare against common evils, we may make the blue our national color on double grounds. It speaks to us of the freedom that reaches beyond the fair vaults of heaven or the azure expanse of mountain and sea. The color of sapphire and turquoise reflects from the gates of heaven and adorns the mantle of our Queen. Knights and maids of honor, we wear her ribbon as tokens of our allegiance to the august Sovereign whose virtues we strive to imitate. We bend our knees for her blessing and ask her to make use of our service to defend

the walls of Sion in this New World, the interests of our American Church, and under her guidance we may hope to carry on successfully the crusade against the false doctrines and lax morals of our day.

"Cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo."

## Conditions and Advantages,

There are but few requisites as conditions for the proper reception of the Blue Scapular.

1. It is to be made of woolen cloth, blue in color. There is usually a picture of the *Immaculata* on one side of the Scapular, but this is not essential. The strings may be of any color and material.

2 The Scapular is to be blessed. This requires a special faculty. If Priests ask their Bishops for it they will obtain it. Otherwise the General of the Theatines (at *San Andrea Della Valle*), in Rome, will grant the same and send all necessary instructions.

3. There is *no inscribing* of names.

4. No special forms of prayer or devotional practices are essential. Any pious work may be offered to God with the intention mentioned above as the particular object of the devotion. The wearing of the Scapular is, of course, necessary, and it acts as a help and reminder, morning and night, of our resolution to cultivate the virtues expressed by the symbol.

5. There are numerous spiritual advantages and indulgences to be obtained under the usual conditions by Catholics who sincerely repent of their sins and pledge their good will to lead pure lives. (See Analecta : Privileges of the *Blue Scapular*.)

6. Every mass said for a deceased person who has during life worn the Blue Scapular enjoys the *privilegium altaris*, no matter on what altar or by whom the mass is celebrated.

## Conclusion.

The month of May gives to devout Catholics a special impulse and inspiration to do something in honor of our Blessed Lady. It also offers more numerous opportunities than other seasons, for inculcating whatever zeal and charity may suggest to a faithful priest for benefiting his people.

A very efficient way to accomplish both these ends is to explain the meaning and to recommend the wearing of the Blue Scapular. This will be an opportunity all the more desirable, if we should have been either the conscious or the innocent cause of neglect to have

the names of persons whom we have invested with other Scapulars inscribed and who consequently lose the privileges of affiliation to the congregations which the Scapulars, requiring enrolment, represent. Here we have a method of making reparation.

Thus we may increase our forces for good, and aid in the promotion of true prosperity amid our people in this land of the free, so full of temporal blessings yet so full of dangers on that very account. Let the fair blue mantle of our spotless Queen touch every child of the Catholic Church in America, proud that we may wear the beautiful emblem of her Immaculate Conception, an omen of blessings for us and our country.

*Et sic in Sion firmata sum, et in civitate sanctificata similiter requievi et in Jerusalem potestas mea !*

---

## MUSIC IN THE SEMINARY.

The series of articles contributed to the REVIEW on the subject of clerical studies by the Rev. J. Hogan, D. D., of the Catholic University, shall furnish the present writer both with a text and with an apology for venturing to discuss in these pages the position which music should hold in the curriculum. We desire to make a plea for more attention to vocal culture, and to the history and theory of ecclesiastical music, ancient and modern, than is ordinarily given to these subjects in Catholic seminaries. Of course, a general argument for broadening the course of studies might be found in the fact that the Church should still keep, in this "age of the electric light," that wonderful pre-eminence of hers which eighteen centuries of our Christian civilization have attested with an unvarying and most impressive emphasis. For *Trivium* and *Quadrivium* shall no more be the measure of intellectual training. The "encyclopædia" is made vastly more ample in our times than the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία of the Greeks, the "*orbis doctrinae*" of Seneca. Steam and electricity have canopied our minds with ever-widening horizons of intellectual progress; so that, alas, even by jealous hoarding and specialization of energy the brief span of life can furnish us but grudgingly the alms of a partial and short-lived success. The purely theological studies of our curriculum could alone baffle the mental energies of a life-time. In them, too, the spirit of specialization has been at work, and has indicated various particular lines of thought still leading the despairing inquirer to an *embarras*

*de richesse.* Nevertheless, we are here contending for a multiplication of studies in the Seminary; and from the pleas of general and special culture we are striving to draw arguments for broadening the course in music. Let it be granted that we cannot attain to a tithe of the wide intellectual riches that mock our very avarice—what then? Shall we embrace the sad doctrines of an "optimistic pessimism," as the philosophy of Horace has been rather paradoxically termed, and, crying out with that pagan poet,

> Quid brevi fortes jaculamur aevo
> Multa?

forthwith make the Horatian inference,

> Laetus in praesens animus quod ultra est
> Oderit curare?

Begging the reader's kind indulgence for this rather lengthy preface—meant, however, to anticipate the *non-multa-sed-multum* objection urged so untiringly and so successfully against the multiplication of studies in our seminaries—we proceed to make a plea for greater breadth as well as greater depth in the subject of ecclesiastical music.

I.

(Le beau est aussi utile que l'utile,-plus, peut-être.)
*Victor Hugo.*

Perhaps a sufficient answer to the objection we have just stated would be a clear appreciation of the position of the time-honored "learned professions" in relation to this modern intellectual hurry and bustle. If at any time the man of one book is to be feared, it surely is at the present day. But this gentleman is most to be feared because he is not sufficiently fearful. He is too apt to construct a little heaven and earth of his own; and his philosophy too often dreams not of the "more things" hidden in the larger earth his feet tread so lightly, and in the wider heaven which "baffles him forever." We fear him, not because he knows his specialty so well, but because he knows it so imperfectly. Principle rubs against principle in the machinery of science: the more we know, the less, as a rule, shall any single principle be urged in its widest extent. The dogmatism of the present day is the dogmatism of the "specialist." Says Matthew Arnold—correct here, at least—in his *New Age:*

> Bards make new poems;
> Thinkers new schools;
> Statesmen new systems;
> Critics new rules;

All things begin again
Life is their prize;
Earth with their deeds they fill—
Fill with their cries.

In an age which finds a separate sphere of activity for every faculty of body and mind, which is so apt to educate hand at the expense of head, and head at the expense of heart, it is a refreshing thing to meet the man whose culture is the product of education in its primary meaning—of a harmonious blending of his physical, mental and spiritual powers. There is, in all our "push and go," in all the utilitarian heresy of the times, room still for the man of "general" culture. His temperate judgments, his world-wide sympathies, his appreciation of the good, the true, the beautiful, in whatever forms they assume, his well-rounded scholarship — all will prove an instructive object-lesson to the New Age:

Thundering and bursting
In torrents, in waves,
Carrolling and shouting,
Over tombs, amid graves;
See on the cumbered plain,
Clearing a stage,
Scattering the past about,
Comes the New Age.

Now we might quote endless testimony of the highest authority in asserting the prerogatives of music in the culture of head, and heart, and hand. "Plato and Aristotle agree in thinking that the rhythm and harmony of music inspire the soul with the love of order, with harmoniousness, regularity, and a soothing of the passions."[1] "Is it not, then," says Plato in his *Republic*, "on these accounts that we attach such supreme importance to a musical education, because rhythm and harmony sink most deeply into the recesses of the soul, bringing gracefulness in their train, and making a man graceful if he be rightly nurtured; but if not, the reverse?" . . . .[2] We might show at length how this precious heirloom has come down to us through the *quadrivium* of the Middle Ages, in which it held an honored place. We might trace the religious pedigree of music from our own day, back through the Ages of Faith to the time when it brought sweetest tears to the eyes of St. Augustine, back through the apostolic ages till we find "great David's greater Son" singing the hymn with His disciples before going out to Mount Olivet, back to the Second Temple, in

1. Compayré: History of Pedagogy, p. 20. 2. Version of Vaughan and Davies.

whose chanting, doubtless, the same Divine Master joined, "to ulfill all justice," back to the splendid service of the First Temple, back to the canticle of Moses on the banks of the Red Sea, back to the morning hymn of creation, "when all the sons of God made a joyful melody." But music, the first-born of the arts, does not, or should not, need any recommendation either of pedagogy or of liturgies in these latter days.[1]

Nevertheless, while the culturing power of music is generally admitted, and the necessity of some familiarity with its genius and laws cheerfully conceded in theory, the utilitarian character of the age we live in has virtually, if not formally, constituted a new "specialty"—has branded it with a trade-mark, and made of it almost as distinct a profession as law or medicine; so that any one who for the sake of personal improvement essays acquiring a becoming mediocrity in the science or art of music is weighed, not in the balance of general culture, but in that of trade skill, and is forthwith dubbed an "amateur." That this tendency, from a pedagogical point of view, seems to be false and misleading, we should not be required to prove. But we call attention to the tendency

1. A certain Dr. Hanchett, a musician, wrote an article for the November number, 1890, of the *Voice Magazine*, on "The Mission of Music." The editor sent a list of questions to various prominent authors and educators, inviting criticism of the article. In justice let it be said that the opinions passed on the position of music in the "fine arts," its power for good in training the character, its value as a mental discipline, etc., ran through the whole range of favorable and adverse criticism. Whilst no question was put as to its position in the curriculum of colleges, some of the correspondents chose to allude to that phase of the subject. We beg indulgence for a few extracts. Julian Hawthorne says: "Music differs from all other arts or sciences. Its objects and effects are distinct. For that reason music is the most valuable single element in our present scheme of education." T. W. Higginson, the historian, ranks music "higher than any art except the highest poetry." President Low, of Columbia College, says: "It is a refining, civilizing art. It tunes my mind up, often a whole octave. It lifts me into the altitudes of my soul. It pushes all life and pettiness and humdrum cares out of sight." President Hall, of Clark University, ranks music "very high." President Bashford, Ohio Wesleyan University: "Our present education is too purely mental. Education should develop the mental, physical and moral power of the student . . Music tends to develop both the imaginative and emotional faculties, but these faculties are generally neglected by the ordinary school curriculum. I would, therefore, rank music as worthy of insertion in the school and college curriculum, because it cultivates the imaginative and emotional faculties, and thus contributes to that well-rounded development which should be the object of all education. President Grose, University of S. Dakota: He seems to think that the study of music alone should yield all of character. As well decry the study of mathematics because it does not make one a good grammarian or kindly in disposition. Music is one factor in "character-building." He ranks music "as one of the chief educators of the aesthetic faculty, which must be developed if a symmetrical character is to be obtained." May we give a Shaksperian turn to the discussion?

> "The man that hath no music in himself,
> And is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
> Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils."
>
> *Merchant of Venice. Act V, Sc. I.*

here because there is reason to fear that it has made some progress even in the conservative atmosphere of the Catholic seminary, and that it is in some measure responsible for the present peculiarly degenerate state of church music—a state for the bettering of which so many able and pious and energetic musicians now labor in vain.

We began to plead the cause of music from the stand-point of general culture, and we find ourselves unconsciously shifting to the vantage-ground of a utilitarian argument. This latter, indeed, it was our main intent to occupy, albeit we leave with regret the splendid array of argument which the former would present for winning attention to

> The higher things
> Lost with base gain of raiment, food and roof.

Without yielding the point that a sufficient vindication of the high offices of music may be found in the personal advantages gained by its faithful wooers, we shall borrow wisdom from the methods of the present age, and shall make a plea from the rostrum not of the more real, but of the more obvious utility of the study of music.

## II.

"Gratefully use what to thee is given."

*Omar Khayyam.*

What are the uses to which music, the universal heirloom of mankind, should be put? What golden threads of musical culture should give strength and beauty to the texture of ecclesiastical education?

We spoke of the present degraded status of church music. It is a status that has called forth much comment in public and private. Reasoning, and wit, and satire have exhausted themselves to little purpose. After all, if any reform is to be made in the present state of affairs, should it not be championed, inaugurated, and carried on by the great body of the priesthood? Councils and synods may preach the higher things, and point the way to their attainment—a sign-post shall never bring the listless traveler to his destination. The desideratum seems to be: first, an intelligent appreciation of what church-music *should be*, and what it really is, at present; and secondly, the ability to enter into an intelligent discussion of the means proper for restoring the service of our temples to a position in the musical proprieties demanded by its very nature. But does the seminary aim at imparting any instruction in these matters to its alumni as a body? Is the study of the history and characteris-

tics of sacred music an integral and necessary part of the curriculum? On the contrary, does not the possession of any musical ability by a student constitute him a *specialist*, and not, as it should, merely an abler man amongst his musically-educated fellows? The use which a priest has for a knowledge of geometry, of history, of Latin metres, nay of Canon Law and General Liturgy, cannot be shown to be of more practical moment in his official duties, than the many uses which he has for a knowledge of music. To pass over, for a moment, the imperative function of music in all the solemn offices of the liturgy, we need but instance the practical questions which are at this time clamoring for solution—what kind of music should be considered sacred? what kind may be tolerated by the priest, *meliora sperante*, for the present? what kind he may not brook for a moment? what are the possibilities and advantages of congregational singing? what those of Cecilian music? what those of Gregorian chant? how shall we encourage and properly direct vocal music in the school? how shall we train up the young to an appreciation, as well as a recognition, of the higher music which refines the taste, as opposed to the lighter, more trivial, more sensuous, which may lower the moral as well as the mental tone of the younger folk? How shall the *personnel* of the choir be regulated—by ability purely, or zeal purely, or piety as well as ability? and so on to the end of the chapter. However reasonable this comparison between music and the other branches of instruction cited by way of example may be, the fact still remains that at the end of his course in the Catholic seminary the student that showed special aptitude for any of these latter studies does not find himself, and is not considered, a specialist; but he does find a companion, not brighter in musical knowledge than he himself was in Latin or Canon Law, the *rarissima avis* of a specialist.

In estimating the comparative utility of music, we said we should pass over, for a moment, the *imperative* functions of music in the solemn offices of the liturgy. Here, of course, the strongest argument might be made for a thorough training within, at least, the limits of the Gregorian Chant. Specialization must stop its ravages in the face of the stubborn fact that for the celebrant and the ministers at the altar, no vicarious fulfillment of legal prescription shall be tolerated. Liturgically speaking, they *must* sing. And so, councils and synods have provided some place in the curriculum for plain chant. It has the same reason for existence in such a place, as the study of Rubrics and General Liturgy. But having said this,

we have not said all—we have not said enough. The strange fatality which has been pursuing music has made this common gift of nature—a gift practically co-extensive with that of voice and language—a rare enough specialty in seminaries, even within the province of liturgical necessity. The stubborn facts seem to be not only that plain chant has lost caste, but that it has well nigh sunk out of recognition. No itching of the fingers shall succeed in diverting us into a rhapsody on the subject of Gregorian music. We *will not* say that its "heavenly melodies" must have approached the dignity of inspiration; we will not quote any of the striking testimonies of musicians friendly and inimical to the Church, as to the inherent majesty and power of the liturgical song, or the peculiar fitness of traditional use, its venerable antiquity, its freedom from all worldiness, vanity, or sensual suggestiveness, have given it for clothing the words of the sacred text in becoming drapery. This has been already said, and well said, and often said. And if we should dare to repeat any of that glowing eulogy, it would be for the purpose of calling attention to the incredulous smile, perhaps the undisguised sneer we should provoke. *Caste* has been lost for it, surely, in the musical world. Of that we do not propose to speak; nor indeed, of the amount of clerical humor, too, expended on the subject. But worthy of note is the fact that it has lost *caste* even in the sisterhood of the ecclesiastical sciences. Possessing as eminent a right to recognition as General Liturgy, the tacit understanding amongst all seems to be that while the details of ceremonial should be carefully attended to, any kind of rendition of plain chant will suffice. The man who tries to sing the melody as indicated—in the missal, even—is doing the chant "honor overmuch." The fatuity which gives birth to such a principle of action is another remarkable element in the downward path of Gregorian chant. A first principle in the ceremonies is that decorum be observed—for may not the infinite detail of the rubricists be reduced, in the last analysis, to the most decorous way of doing something which is a necessary part of the liturgy? And thence, we conceive, comes the unwritten law of making a mistake in "ceremonies" as gracefully as possible—"so that no one will be the wiser?" Strange fatuity! We are punctilious in observing the directions of the rubricists—a matter in which many years' study cannot give us more than a mediocre success, and a subject peculiarly foreign to the knowledge, and so often, alas! to the interest of the faithful—and all the while we care little or nothing for decorum in the singing,

a thing which is as common a possession as language ; a subject in which the very children of the congregation may play the part of judges. The seminarian who is in sacred orders will wax warm in defence of the exact degree of profundity in his reverences to the celebrant, and will make merry sport of his weirdly original *Ite missa est.* Nevertheless, while the faithful may not be proficient in geometry or rubrics, they may be depended upon to have a pair of ordinary ears and so all the beauty of ceremonial will be lost in the echoes, both in and out of the church, of our last cacophony. Let us not be understood as speaking in any slighting way of the least of the ceremonies of the Church. We should heartily deprecate such a suspicion, even if the assurance of St. Theresa that she would lay down her life willingly for the observance of each of them were not ringing in our ears. Nay, rather, for the very sake of reverence are we insisting on a decorous performance of one portion of the liturgical service. Do we "despise the small things" in lifting up from the dust the greater? But we must be careful lest, while conscientiously tithing mint and anise and cummin, we leave the weightier things of the liturgical law.

We venture therefore to submit that such a state of affairs as we have described, is, to say the least, one-sided and infelicitous. It is also, we think, pedagogically erroneous. Viewed from the standpoint even of a rigid and narrow utilitarianism, it is a sad neglect of the "practical" advantages of education. If we should seek a reason for this neglect, we should doubtless find the double excuse given of "no time for musical instruction," and "those that have 'ears' don't need it, and those that have not 'ears' couldn't profit by it." The answer to the former might be that in education the evolutionary formula of "survival of the fittest," should, perhaps, be a potent factor in the determination of what few branches shall be selected for the curriculum out of the one hundred and one that clamor for some recognition. But such a principle may well be modified by the other, that "the weak have rights which the strong are bound to respect." The question, then, cannot be peremptorily settled by a final triumphant appeal to the paramount importance of theologics and philosophics, and liturgics *et id genus omne.* Again we fear the man of one book! A scientific pedagogy will regard the usefulness of any special branch of education as a function (to borrow a geometric term) of the results gained divided by the time spent in gaining these results. If we apply this formula to the various branches of study in the clerical curriculum, we shall

not find music the lowest in the scale of utility. We do not propose to enter upon a laborious calculation of the *utilities*, but shall at once proceed to point out some of the *synchronous* results of musical instruction. These may be divided into physical, mental and æsthetic, if we regard vocal music merely as a factor in what is primarily meant by "education." Of the function of music in "instruction," which is too often the latter-day meaning of education, we may speak further on.

It is a patent fact that the long and necessarily severe course of preparation for the high dignity of the priesthood is too apt to strengthen the spiritual at the expense of the animal and vegetative faculties of students. The dark embers give a weird emphasis to the inner fire they can feed no longer. The necessities of our poor clay are humiliating, certainly, but they are stern facts; and a well-rounded culture dare not despise them. Juvenal's proverb about the *mens sana* is nevertheless more remarkable for the endless and universal indifference shown by mankind towards its great lesson, than either for its happy truth, or its venerable antiquity. We are forever killing the hen that lays the golden eggs. The school-room and the school curriculum have come down to us through the misty ages as one unmistakable object-lesson of how-not-to-do-it. Seminaries have not been worse off in this respect than other schools, but their very lengthy course has served to emphasize the principle better. The protests of physicians are, however, at last listened to with some respect, and have resulted in better lighted and better ventilated halls, and various systems of calisthenics for the lower schools, and in the many athletic associations of the colleges and universities. But one very thoughtful recommendation has not been listened to with much deference, or at least, with much result—we mean the introduction into schools of vocal practice. In another place[1] we have pointed to the fact that "the benefit to the physical nature, in developing and strengthening the lungs by deep respirations, places it on a level with calisthenics. Without claiming for it all the 'innumerable advantages' described by physicians of various ages, we may simply note here the comparatively recent testimony of Colombat de l'Isère, who believed it to be a great guard against epidemic diseases. But we may not omit the striking testimony of an eminent English authority of the present day, Gordon Holmes, whose position as physician to the Edinburgh Municipal Throat and Ear Infirmary, and of *chef-de-clinique* at the

1 Course of Study for the Philadelphia Parochial Schools.

Hospital for Diseases of the Throat, entitled his opinion to special consideration. He says: 'The general well-being of the constitution is promoted by voice-practice, because the wider chest movements accelerate the circulation of the blood, at the same time that they cause a more ample flow of fresh air in and out of the lungs . . . . . And, moreover, these effects have a certain permanency on account of the gains to the thoracic capacity derived from the habitual increase of lung expansion necessitated by constant vocal exercise.' '[1]

But while other physical exercises develop and strengthen particular muscles and sinews, and contribute therefore only generally to the well-being of the body, vocal exercise directly develops the power of voice-production, and therefore directly strengthens that organ of the body which in a priest is too often the weakest and yet the most necessary in his public ministry. This thought opens out wide vistas of demonstration of its utility which, however, we may not enter upon now.

The purely physical value of singing places it, therefore, on a level with calisthenics. But besides this, music has what calisthenics has not, the concomitant element of a strong mental stimulus and disciplinary power. A writer in the *Normal Review* has pointed out that "Music, when rightly studied, becomes a *means of mental discipline* over which mathematics, with all its boasted glory, can claim no superiority. Any one who sings will acknowledge at once that no problem in arithmetic calls for a keener use of the perceptive faculties than does the singing, at sight, of a difficult piece of music." We shall not discuss the æsthetic gains resulting from vocal culture. We have already, in the first part of this essay, hinted at some of them. But we may note here that not a little of the difficulty that stands at present in the way of congregational singing would be removed, as the priest would then be in fact, what he is in theory, the natural exponent and teacher of ecclesiastical music.

We should, then, recommend a course of instruction in vocal music, extending throughout the whole of the seminary course, and if possible, through the whole of the preparatory collegiate course. Fifteen minutes' daily practice would soon demonstrate, better than many words, the justice of our plea. Indeed, under a competent teacher, a few months of such practice would yield, even in the most obdurate cases, little short of musical miracles. And here we glance

1 A Treatise on Vocal Physiology and Hygiene, etc., p. 217.

for a moment at the second objection urged against spending time in the study of music, viz., that instruction and practice are quite unnecessary for any one who has a "voice" and an "ear," and hopelessly useless for any one who has not. We need scarcely say that such a plea can have currency only where the stock of musical information is of the scantiest kind. The limits of our essay will not admit a proof of the statement; nor, indeed, as we are not addressing novices in music or in educational matters, is there any necessity for proof. But from the double fact that good voices and good ears require culture, and that defective ones can by culture be vastly improved, we beg to insist again on what we conceive to be a first requisite in any musical course in our seminaries, namely, daily voice-practice. By this, intonation could be made correct and secure; volume could be marvellously improved; the *timbre* could be made much more pleasing. We should then have a demonstration that the rarest of the *lusus naturae* is an absolute lack of responsiveness to melody—the *bête noir* of a bad ear. In his own experience in the class-room the present writer has found ample demonstration of the power which even scant vocal practice has for improving volume and intonation and *timbre*. He has found classes bashful, listless, discouraged; he has left them hopeful, energetic, and filled with a pleasing sense of security in their ability to sing. Singing, like swimming, is a natural operation; but, like it, requires some courage for the first plunge. He has found the patient drilling of a few lessons changing what sounded at first like the confused murmur of distant seas into a rich, round, decided, choral unison. Defective ears, slovenly intonation, and harsh voices, together with listlessness and vocal mannerisms, were responsible for the former; a little effort and patient practice for the latter.

While the class could be made to join ultimately in the exercises as a whole, sufficient time should be given to individual voice practice first of all. This is, indeed, the most important part of the training. In a Catholic seminary there should be no class of "incurables"—to borrow a word from the Rev. Arthur Ryan. Too often, alas! we charge to nature the results of our own carelessness and physical improvidence. The eve of ordination is hardly the proper time for beginning to realize the fact that the liturgical offices generally require singing as a *sine qua non* of their performance, and that both ear and voice declare their utter unfitness for the task. Shall we say that nature has played the step-mother to us? That no one can remedy a congenital defect?

Side by side with voice culture should begin some instruction in the elementary theory of music, the conventional modes, ancient and modern, of representing sounds to the eye, the nature of intervals, etc. The history of church music would furnish occasional variety and give interest to a subject which is, however, by no means a dry one. Some *obiter dicta* in the Pastoral Theology of Church-music, some suggestions about "our choir," "our organists," "our solo-music," might not be amiss; and if they were made in the spirit of their subject could not fail to provoke a healthy laughter. In fine, the class might be constantly reminded of the words of St. Bernard: "Sunt quidam voce dissoluti, qui vocis suae modulatione gloriantur, nec tantum gaudent de dono gratiae, sed etiam alios spernunt. Tumentes elatione aliud cantant, quam libri habeant, tanta est levitas vocis, forsitan et mentis. Cantant ut placeant populo magis quam Deo." Insistence should be made on singing the exact melodies of the chant, on the ground that beauty unadorned is, especially in plain chant, adorned the most. Thus on the basis of nature might be built a decent superstructure of a knowledge of ancient and modern tonalities—the former necessary for the priest in his sacred functions, and the latter able to clothe, with other than merely official authority, his supervision of the music performed in his church.

H. T. HENRY.

---

## THE PERSONALITY OF CHRIST.

ONE of the most striking features of the so-called Reformation, is its gross inconsistency. When Luther separated from the *old* Church, he found it necessary to have a body of doctrine, and he forthwith excogitated that famous watchword of the *new* religion, "Faith alone justifies." He lived to repent the folly of attempting to improve upon the Church of God. The dictum *Crede firmiter sed pecca fortiter*, was disastrous to morality, which is intimately connected with dogma, and we have the testimony of the German monk himself, that the people were much worse in point of morals in his time, than they had been under the Popes.

Whilst "Creeds not deeds" was the peon of the Reformers, Protestantism of to-day has veered completely around, and made it "Deeds not creeds." Such is the fate of error: it is by its nature

inconsistent. Similarly great changes have taken place in regard to other dogmas of the Christian faith. We find ministers of the gospel, denying the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation—two of the fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion. Under such circumstances sincere Protestants turn to the Catholic Church for a solution of questions of the soul which hinge upon facts of revealed truth. It will not then be deemed an idle speculation if we turn to one of the fundamental subjects of this kind—namely, the Personality of Christ, and trace it briefly in its dogmatic bearing.

Our exposition of the dogma will consist of a summary of what the best theologians have written on the subject.

*Person* is distinguishable but not separable from *nature*, for no person is really conceivable as existing without a nature; and though human as well as divine nature is distinguishable from person, yet neither is conceivable as existing without person or personality. The human nature of Christ is not human nature divested of personality; it is a human nature as much as is the human nature of Peter or John, but its person is divine, not human. Hence Christ is two distinct natures in one person, which divine person is God or the Second Person of the ever-adorable Trinity. Human nature cannot exist without a personality, and the human nature of Christ was not, and could not have been generated without His divine personality. As our soul united to our body makes but one person, so the Son of God united to the soul and body which He assumed, makes also but one person. Christ as God has a Father but no mother; and as man he has a Mother and no father. Christ as God has a Father because He is the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father. As man He has no father, because He was conceived by the operation of the Holy Ghost. The Blessed Virgin, then, is really the Mother of God, because the Son of God took in her womb a body and soul like ours. Mary really conceived and brought forth the Man-God. The body of the Son of God was formed of the substance of Mary. All this is of faith. The Church is ever on the alert to condemn any error, however slight, regarding the Incarnation, for she knows that on this dogma rests the whole scheme of Christianity. Destroy the Incarnation and all religion becomes a mere name. Grace and Redemption are out of the question.

In the Incarnation it is not the divine nature that loses its personality, but the human nature that gains, instead of its own, the divine personality. God retains in the Incarnation His own divine person, as the one person of the two ever-distinct natures, and is no more

under a finite form as incarnated, than He is as not incarnated. He loses, He gains nothing; it is the human nature assumed that gains. It is modified and singularly elevated by receiving a divine instead of a human personality; but God the divine person remains unchanged, unaffected, immutable in all the fulness, majesty and glory of His own eternal and incommunicable divinity. In the Incarnation, the divine nature is not incarnated, but the divine person, that is the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity; and the Incarnation is not in the divine person becoming subject to the limitation of the human person, but in taking human nature up to Himself, and giving it the dignity of His own person.

Christ is one person, *suppositum hypostasis* or subsistence, and in this one person subsist, forever distinct and inseparable, two natures, the human and divine. So that He is not two persons or two subsistences, but two natures subsisting in one person. The divine nature is common to each of the three persons, all and entire, undivided, indivisible, indistinguished, under each one of them, but the three persons in their personality are distinct from one another, and one can never be another. Person is incommunicable. This is a philosophical axiom. It is an error to suppose that the doctrine of two distinct natures, subsisting in one person of Christ, necessarily implies that of two subsistences; for two natures may without implying any contradiction have only one subsistence. The word person does not express the limitation or circumscription of rational nature in its completeness or supreme dignity, and therefore may apply to God as well as to man. And since God is unlimited and infinite, person may be infinite as well as finite. It cannot be said that the divine nature is changed after the Incarnation. When we say that God became man, the becoming or change is on the part of the nature assumed, not on the part of the person assuming. There is not and cannot be the least impropriety in predicating all that we predicate of God or the divine nature.

Christ as God is, at the same time, the suppositum of the human nature assumed, and as that nature loses nothing, but gains in perfection by being assumed, or having a divine instead of a human suppositum, there can be just as little impropriety of predicating of Him all that belongs to a perfect man. Human and divine things are predicable of Christ not in a figurative or representative sense, but really and truly, and in the strictest sense of the words; because He is in the strictest sense both God and man, not in the blending, intermingling, or confusion of the two natures, but in their distinctiveness as the only simple suppositum of the two.

Nature to do or to suffer must be concrete, must have its suppositum, and the doing or suffering, though impossible without nature, is predicable solely of the nature in its suppositum. As the suppositum in Christ is the same for both natures, whatever is done or suffered by Him is done and suffered by one and the same suppositum. He is God because He is a divine person or suppositum, and in Christ the suppositum or person is not separable from the divine nature. He is a man because He has a perfect human nature, and is in His one person its person. The whole mystery of the Incarnation is precisely here. Christ is one Christ, one person, and there is no divine Christ distinguishable from the human and vice versa. The humanity of Christ has no suppositum, never had any suppositum separate and distinct from the divine suppositum of the Word made flesh. The Word did not assume a human person, but a human nature. But this does not dissolve the person of Christ. Nor can it be said that God was born in His divinity, nor that He died in His divine nature; for He was before all worlds, from all eternity, immortal and impassible. This is predicated by His human nature, which from the moment of the Incarnation was as truly His as was the divine nature. Now, as person and nature are inseparable, though distinct, we can say it was truly God that suffered and died for us.

All this is beautifully explained in the Athanasian Creed from which we quote. "Furthermore it is necessary for salvation that we believe rightly the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man: God of the substance of the Father begotten before worlds; and man of the substance of His Mother born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father as touching His God-head; and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood. Who, although He be God and man, yet is not two, but one Christ. One not by conversion of the God-head into flesh, but by the taking of the manhood into God. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.

"For as the rational soul and body is one man, so God and man is one Christ who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of the Father, God Almighty, from which He shall come to judge the living and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give an account

of their works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that shall have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the Catholic faith, which unless a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved."

J. J. QUINN.

---

## AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND EUROPEAN SCHOOL LEGISLATION.

CUI bono? This question has doubtless been asked by many, interested in the present school controversy, who have read a somewhat lengthy Associated Press despatch from Berlin, which came to light some time ago in Baltimore,[1] and was reproduced not only in the secular press throughout the country, but also in some Catholic journals. Its object was ostensibly "to give a review of the policy of the Church towards State schools and of the present condition of the school question in the principal countries of Europe," and its author was said to be "a Catholic prelate deeply interested in the subject of public education."

The despatch might have been forgotten or passed over if a certain importance, as well as a wider circulation among Catholics, had not been recently given it by the fact that Dr. Bouquillon introduced it into the last installment of his well-known pamphlet: Education: to whom does it belong?[2] The author makes some comments on the despatch which, despite his former protest of dealing only with "theoretical principles," are very suggestive of definite practical tendencies.

As "the facts" of the despatch are not quite true and as the deductions actually drawn from it are seriously misleading, we deem it an honored duty and a service done to American Catholics to set forth the actual facts, and to point out the legitimate conclusions following upon them so far as they can be of any use to us in the struggle for maintaining a right position on the subject of popular education.

The facts stated in the despatch must for clearness' sake be briefly repeated. They are substantially as follows: In *Prussia*, "the programme of the deputies and of the bishops does not propose that the Church shall have free (parochial) schools over which the State is to have no rights . . . . the Church in no wise denies the

1 Baltimore, Sun., Dec. 23. 2 A Rejoinder to the Civiltà Cattolica. Appendix pp. 35-41.

right of the State over the schools;" "a similar policy has been adopted by the Church in *Austria*;" in *France* the Catholics "without ceasing to adhere to the new system (of 'gratuitous and compulsory education') sought to secure the right of both Church and State" . . . . certain bishops "employed the official teachers (of neutral schools) to give catechism lessons outside of school premises" and "have carefully abstained from issuing any edicts depriving of the sacraments those parents who send their children to neutral (non-sectarian) schools; in *Belgium* "the Holy See obliged the Belgian episcopate to assume the same position with regard to M. Frère-Orban's law on non-sectarian education; in *Italy* "a concerted effort is everywhere being made to promote religious instruction in the public and obligatory schools by a prudent compliance with circumstances."

From "these facts" the sender of the despatch draws the following conclusions for the benefit of American Catholics: "*First*, that the Catholic Church does not practically contest the right of the State over the primary schools, and that this implied recognition is especially admitted in German-speaking countries; *second*, that the Church everywhere strives to have religious instruction given in the public schools by adapting itself to the existing laws; *third*, that the Church never condemns to deprivation of the sacraments those who send children to public schools in which there is no immediate and certain danger to faith and morals; *fourth*, that the State school in which religious instruction is given seems to be the *practical ideal of the Catholic parties* of the Continent."

Let us examine the "facts" and in doing so keep in mind the avowed object of the despatch which was: to show the attitude of European Catholics towards *neutral schools* and the *principles* defended by them in regard to the "direct" and "proper" right or mission of the *State* to educate and to establish compulsory education.

## General Observations.

For the better understanding of the present state of school legislation in Europe it will be necessary to make a brief historical review.

Up to the Reformation, State schools, as well as compulsory education, were wholly unknown in Europe. The Church had entire control of the school. Janssen, in his learned work,[1] bears out the

1 See the chapter on "Popular Schools" before the Reformation, I, 2.

assertion that the Church was never more active in the matter of popular education than precisely in the XVth century, and this particularly in Germany. In the articles of the peace of Westphalia (Art. 32) the school is mentioned as the "annexum religionis," and it is stipulated that all things connected with Church and school should be left to the management of each denomination. This same stipulation was formally renewed in 1803 for the then German Empire.[1] Luther and Melanchthon had earnestly recommended that the secular princes, as supreme masters temporal and spiritual of their realms, should have control of the schools. It was an efficient measure for carrying into practice the principle: *Cujus regio ejus et religio.*

The same principle obtained in France through the Revolution. According to Danton the children belonged to the State first and then to the parents. The *Université*, that is to say, the central board of education for the whole of France, established by Napoleon I, although it introduced once more religious instruction into the schools, was, in point of fact, imbued with the ideas of State-absolutism. This spirit has prevailed in France up to the present day. It was in truth French influence which introduced State education in several of the states of Germany, whilst at the same time the influence of the Church was being constantly weakened by the spoliation of her possessions. Prussia's Protestant government hastened to proclaim in its Landrecht (public right), 1794, Feb. 6, the following principle, which has been and still is a part of the so-called "Prussian traditions:" "All public institutions for instruction and education are under the control of the State, and are at all times subject to the examination and visitation of the State authorities.[2] In the same right the popular schools are distinctly declared to be "Institutions of the State."[3] In Catholic Bavaria compulsory education was introduced by Minister Montgelas, a freemason. Josephinism willingly aided the work of the secret societies in Austria by promoting State education. Liberalism, under the deceitful motto, "instruction laïque, gratuite et obligatoire," is to-day in all European States the heir and promoter of the principles of 1789 in general, and of compulsory State education and school monopoly in particular.

1 Decree of the Deputies, Feb. 25, 1803.

2 "Alle offentlichen Uterrichts-und Erziehungsanstalten stehen unter der Aufsicht des Staates und mussen sich den Prufungen und Visitationen desselben zu allen Zeiten unterwerfen."

3 Veranstaltungen des Staates.

## I.—PRUSSIA.

Only one-third of the population of Prussia is Catholic. Their representatives, the illustrious Deputies of the Centre, must of necessity be, and remain, a minority in the Prussian Landtag,[1] which includes the House of Representatives (Abgeordnetenhaus) and the Senate (Herrenhaus). The majority in both Houses is composed of the Conservatives, almost all Protestants, and of the different parties of Liberals, who are bound together by a common tie—hostility towards the Catholic Church. As the King of Prussia is at the same time the Summus Episcopus of the Protestant Church, it has never happened, within the last forty years, that any loyal Catholic was chosen to be member of the ministry. The Minister of Public Worship especially has always been a Protestant. The Government, Conservatives and Liberals unanimously declare, that all schools are "institutions of the State," that the State must have supreme control over all teaching, including religious doctrine. Under such circumstances it is manifestly futile to expect that the Government or Parliament would ever recognize the full rights of the Church in the matter of education. Never. Nay, this very Government and this majority consider themselves justified in making laws concerning the internal management of the Catholic as well as of the Protestant Church. They have done so, and many of these laws are still in force. It is true that many of them, as v. g. those concerning the administration of Church property, have been "recognized" by the Catholic body, that is, the Catholics have "adapted" themselves to the circumstances, and this with the approbation of the Pope and the Bishops. Every pastor in Prussia (we speak from experience !) knows what a vexation such measures are ; but he must accept them and comply with them if he is to remain a "possibility." As long as Prussia exists, the Catholic pastors will have to be satisfied with this "practical ideal." These measures form in Prussia a part of the "religious-political legislation of the State," they guarantee what is called "the obligatory State control over the administration of parishes." The Bishops do not protest against them, neither does the Centre party ; it may be truly said that "the programme of the Deputies and of the Bishops does not

1 It throws a curious light on the information of the Berlin correspondent who sent the above mentioned despatch that he repeatedly mentions the "Reichstag" in connection with the school-law of Prussia. The *Reichstag* or Imperial Parliament has nothing to do with the school-legislation of Prussia, which is within the exclusive province of the "Landtag" or legislative body of that kingdom.

propose that the Church shall have free" administration of the parishes "over which the State is to have no rights;" they do not "claim" independence of this administration; they "do not practically contest such rights of the State"—but this passive though express compliance with the existing laws and conditions is far from "implying" that the Catholics of Prussia recognize the management of schools as the proper and special "right of the State." And to propose such a condition of things as the *practical ideal* for American Catholics is in reality an insult to the Catholic episcopate of America as to that of Prussia which would be far from sanctioning such an ideal if it were not a practical necessity.

The Catholic Centre party of Germany has become remarkable throughout the world for two things: Its unfailing adherence to Catholic teaching as well as loyalty to the authority of the Church, and the prudent diplomatic discernment of its leaders. In all questions of moment it has acted according to the well known principle of Montalembert: *en politique il n'y a de légitime que ce qui est possible.* And this has been its deportment in the school question. It has never yielded in its political programme even the smallest right of the Church; but, on the other hand, it has had the sagacity not to advocate in that programme certain propositions of the syllabus, although it has always manfully defended the syllabus in all of its propositions, not excepting those regarding education, whenever there was occasion for doing so. That only is *possible* for the Centre in Prussia, for which it can obtain the consent of the Government and of at least a part of the majority of the House. For this reason it has never combatted compulsory education; it recognizes the present situation and "has always maintained" conjointly with the Conservatives, "that Church and State should cooperate peaceably and harmoniously in the management of secular and religious instruction." It supports with all its power the religious tendency of the Prussian Government, which always recognized the necessity of religious instruction, and which could never be induced by the Liberals to make the State schools non-denominational or neutral, not even during the Culturkampf. Hence the despatch is at fault when it says that the Catholics protested, because "under the Falk ministry the priest and Catholic instruction were excluded from the primary schools." The Falk school laws were strenuously opposed by the Catholics because they distinctly and openly asserted the *principle* that the schools belong to the *State alone*, that the State has the control over *all* branches of instruction,

over all teachers, those of religion included, not only in the elementary schools but in seminaries as well; the Catholics were opposed to the Falk Laws because they removed many priests—not all—from the position of provincial or local inspectors of schools, and by a system of "simultaneous" or "mixed" schools made it impossible in many places—not everywhere—for the clergy to teach or manage or even visit the schools. It sounds almost like irony, when the despatch, after thus misleading its readers, adds: "what was claimed, however, by the Catholics in all protests and petitions (against the Falk Laws) was not freedom of education." Every one knows that the era of the Falk Laws was a time when the State more than ever oppressed the Church, when many Bishops and priests were imprisoned or exiled, when it was forbidden to say Mass without the permission of the State. It was a time then when Catholics did not think of seeking vindication of the rights of education, because they had not even the liberty to *live* and *die* as Catholics!

What course did the Centre pursue in the school question when the Government ceased open hostility, and was forced to call religion to its aid in its onslaught upon Socialism? In the words of the dying Emperor, William I., whose life the assassin Nobling had attempted, it proclaimed aloud: "Religion must be given back to the people." Hence the State school must again be made denominational everywhere, and the minister of religion must be allowed *free* access to the school! This was at the time not only the most necessary measure, but also the only possible one. The Government and the majority of the Houses upheld the "principle of the State's control over all schools;" the Protestant minister, Stoecker, one of the leaders of the Conservatives, declared solemnly, as late as 1889, that "it would never be permitted in Prussia to teach this principle." On this account Dr. Kopp, Bishop of Breslau—who is also a member of Herrenhaus,—declared, as the despatch says, "that the State school principle should not be discussed." On this account Windthorst said expressly in the Abgeordnetenhaus: "We demand only what we *can* and *must* demand; we acknowledge the constitution, because it guarantees religious instruction, and we will support it; we ask only for the abolition of the State control established by the Falk Law and the acknowledgment of the principle that the Church alone has power to *direct* (leiten) religious instruction." Even in 1889 the principle was not recognized by the majority in Parliament, and Windthorst's proposition was defeated. The despatch says: "In order to reach a thorough

understanding of this campaign, which was begun some time ago by Herr Windthorst, one should remember that the Church in no wise denies the right of the State over the school, but does deny the right of the State to exclude the co-operation of the Church." But we would also call to mind the fact that neither in Prussia nor anywhere else has the Church ever affirmed the inherent, special and proper right of the State over the schools. As far as the practical side of the question is concerned we know that the Church does not actually contest the right over primary education which Prussia and all the States mentioned assume. This is simply recognizing a condition of affairs which the Church could not prevent, however much she might wish to do so, and her prudent compliance with circumstances by no means involves any recognition of the right as inherent in the State. Thinking only of the salvation of souls, she adapts herself to the existing laws. Not being able to struggle against brute force, she demands that the souls, so dear to our Divine Saviour, may not be taken away from her entirely, and that some place may be left to her ministers in the State schools; and when a modern State, like Prussia, from motives of self-preservation, opens the doors of its schools to religious teaching, she accepts, even with gratitude, what she might otherwise demand in strict justice. But surely this is not a normal situation. Nor is it befitting the divine mission of the Church and its right and duty of teaching all nations in virtue of the divine "ergo" (data est mihi omnis potestas, euntes *ergo* docete. . .) independent of every earthly power. There can be but two motives for the action of the Church in such cases as those mentioned: the arrogance of the modern State and her own love of souls. The Centre party in Prussia follows faithfully this attitude of the Church. Instead of generalizing the fact and of deducting from it his favored conclusion for the American public, the author of the despatch "from Berlin" would have done better to study the fact and the question *in Berlin* itself, "in order to reach a *thorough* understanding of this campaign." If he had consulted the heirs of the great Windthorst's policy in this matter, he would have learned the following facts:

1st.—That compulsory education (Schulzwang) as it exists in Prussia, is compulsory education in the State school (Zwangsschule); that the Catholics are not allowed to establish their own schools; that they demanded in vain for many years the permission to estab-

lish at least a Catholic University which the Government refused in so categorical a manner, that they entirely abandoned the project.

2d.—That the Centre party never affirmed in its programme that the State as such had the mission to educate.

3rd.—That the *Catholic Deputies* considering the question from their own practical standpoint did not, do not, and will not protest against compulsory education: *a*, because such protestation would be fruitless in view of the "Prussian traditions;" *b*, because by it, as proposed, religious instruction is also secured to Catholic children; *c*, because the establishment of parochial schools would be actually impossible in many parishes without the aid of the State; that therefore they claim only the abolition of the "Zwangsschule," and demand the liberty to have free schools or at least private schools.

4th.—That the "practical ideal" of the German Catholics was expressed in the meeting of all the Bishops of Germany (not only of Prussia,) held in Würzburg, November 14, 1848, in the following words: "The Church claims now as it ever did, the unrestricted liberty of instruction and education, the establishment and direction of her own institutions for instruction and education in the widest sense." "We must reject," said they, "every measure which encroaches on this domain as incompatible with the just claims of the Catholics of Germany."

5th.—That "in order to foster among the Catholic people the true principles concerning education" and to "prevent the loss of correct views on the school question by the autocratic ruling of the State," a society, the "Canisiusverein," was founded during the Culturkampf with the express purpose of keeping the people enlightened in this matter; that the most prominent Catholics and Catholic writers on pedagogy are at the head of this association;[1] that the first pamphlets published in the name of this society bear the title: "State education as a principle is to be rejected," "State education in its consequences is pernicious;" that the same principles were developed again and again almost every year in the great

1 To wit: Dr. Haffner, Bishop of Mayence; Dr. Knecht, Dr. Schulte, Dr. Kleinheidt, etc. On the committee are among others Baron de Loë, Dr. Schaefler, Dr. Dasbach, Deputies of the Centre party.

Catholic Congresses of Germany and explained by many Catholic writers besides those mentioned of that country.[1] All the works of the "Canisiusverein" are written in the same spirit; not in one of them a natural right over education is attributed to the State. The Deputy Dasbach, well known as one of the most scholarly and worthy priests of Germany, an editor of several journals learnedly defends the thesis: "The State has neither an innate nor an inherited nor an acquired right over the education of youth; it has only such right as it took for itself and which Liberalism everywhere claims for it, which is but a constitutional or legal right." This throws some light upon the statement of the despatch that "compulsory education is dear to the German heart at this very time in Germany!" The views of the German Catholics must not be confounded with those of their non-Catholic compatriots, especially when one wishes to prove that the right of the State over education is "The Catholic principle." We should certainly not cavil with a Catholic writer for using his liberty in defending the advantages of compulsory education; we also know that there are among German Catholics those who strongly advocate it, but we protest against the statement that such is or has been the attitude of the "Catholics of Germany" or of their leaders, the Bishops and the Centre party. It might be said that militarism also is "dear to" certain "German hearts," even to some "Catholic hearts." Why? Because the bureaucratic atmosphere in which they have habitually lived has made the people become accustomed to it and to lose sight of the principles of natural liberty. "We have for several decades been accustomed," says the Bishop of Mayence, "to a State monopoly and compulsory education. We are much like children who having been violently torn away in their infancy from their home, have almost forgotten it and look upon their captors as their rightful parents."[2]

To the foregoing facts we add that,

6th.—As is well known, the present Government of Prussia, the Emperor and his Chancellor Caprivi at its head, is profoundly convinced of the necessity of religious instruction in the popular schools.

1 "Die Staatserziehung ist im Princip verwerflich;" "Die Staatserziehung ist in ihren Folgen verderblich," by the celebrated Dr. Knecht. See also Lucas "der Schulzwang ein Stück moderner Tyrannei;" Annuarius Osseg (Pachtler); "Die geistige Knechtung der Völker durch das Schulmonopol des modernen Staates."

2 The Rt. Rev. Dr. Haffner, address before the Catholic Congress of Mayence, September, 1875.

The principal object of the law proposed by the Government a few weeks ago was to suppress all simultaneous or mixed schools and to establish definitively and everywhere denominational schools. What we have said above about the parliamentary parties in Prussia makes it evident that such a law can pass only with the co-operation of the Conservatives and the Centre. Even in the law as originally proposed by the Government there are two points which evidently recall the "Prussian traditions." It declared, 1st, that the schools are "an institution of the State:" 2d, "that the teachers of religion are appointed by the school-board."[1] The Centre party immediately declared that it *neither could or would ever accept the bill* with these features, and *that it would rather sacrifice all the advantages to be derived from the new law than depart in the least from its Catholic principle.* Dr. Hermes, in a pamphlet just published in Germany, explains the Catholic standpoint very clearly. He says: "The fundamental idea of the law is absolutely incorrect. Why? It is certainly the province of the popular school to educate. *But it is not the office of the State, as such, to educate;* this only comes immediately within its sphere; its primary office, above all else, is *to protect the rights of its citizens.* The State is not father, but only the chief protector of right *in foro externo.*" [2]

Another fact is still more eloquent. In the report of the Commission instituted last February to examine the law of instruction, the following phrase was found: "The public school (Oeffentliche Volksschule) is an institution of the State and is under its control."[3] Both the Conservative and Liberal members of the Commission voted in concert for this clause, but the members of the Centre voted with equal unanimity *against it.*

It is well known how, through the combined agency of atheistic socialists and liberalists, the bill has had to be withdrawn. But this very fact goes to show with what hostile elements the Catholics in Prussia have to contend even in their most just claims, and how handicapped they are in shaping what has been miscalled their "practical ideal!" No, indeed; Prussia is not the land to give birth to such ideals—nor to any which could serve as a model for free-born Americans. Ideals assuredly can and must be modelled according to existing circumstances, but one of the most essential

1 "Die Lehrer werden von der Schulbehörde mit der Ertheilung des Religionsunterrichts betraut." Begründung des Entewurfs' J. 17, par. 18.

2 Der Katholische Standpunkt in Bezug auf den Entewurf des Volksschulgeszetes wahrheitsgetreu dargelegt von Dr. Hermes. Cologne, 1892.

3 Die Oeffentliche Schule ist eine Veranstaltung des Staates und steht unter seiner Aufsicht.

conditions of their growth and thriving is an atmosphere of genuine liberty!

## AUSTRIA.

After Prussia the despatch next deals with Austria. "A similar policy has been adopted by the Church of Austria. The Austrian Catholics . . . . . have constantly acknowledged the *same principle* and defended the *same doctrine*." (Italics ours.) "They have ever been unanimous in demanding that the Government should show due respect to the rights of the Church, though *never questioning the State's own rights*." Quite recently the Episcopate "proclaimed this policy of adaptation to the present system of obligatory State schools."—As a matter of fact we would state that,

1. The "Church of Austria" follows no other principles in the question of education than does the universal Catholic Church. The Austrian Episcopate and Austrian Catholics no more defend the so-called rights of the State in education as a principle or doctrine than did the Catholic party in Prussia.

2. Unfortunately Liberalism has had controling influence in the ministry of Austria as well as in its Parliament, for years. Since 1866, when the Protestant Chancellor, Herr von Beust and the ministry of Plener & Co. came into power, the Liberal majority introduced non-denominational schools into a country almost exclusively Catholic, and sought to eliminate religion in every way from public instruction. These liberal schools have been most detrimental to the religion and morals of the country, and have moreover undermined the traditional Austrian patriotism. True to its programme, Liberalism looks upon the schools as obligatory State institutions. The so-called reaction, under the undecided ministry of Count Taafe, did not bring about any essential change in this respect. The Catholics, as a Parliamentary party, have not the unity and therefore not the strength and influence of the Centre in Prussia. On this account the system which the "Catholic Prelate" of the despatch calls the "practical ideal" is forced upon the Austrian Bishops by circumstances; they openly lament the present situation and point out the harmful effect of the State schools both to Church and Government; they insist upon the necessity of religious doctrine as the principal branch of instruction, and upon the right of the Church to control the religious part of education.

3. Thus the Catholics of Austria are simply forced to adapt themselves to the present system in as far as their religious convictions

will allow. "This adaptation," as the despatch correctly states, "is a part of their programme; but the author confounds two very distinct ideas and contradicts himself when he represents the unavoidable "adaptation to a system" as equivalent to a defence of the "principles" and of the "doctrine" on which that system is founded.

4. Again, if the Catholics in their practical programme have "never questioned the State's right" in the matter of education, circumstances show quite plainly that the maxim "qui tacet consentire videtur" can find no application here.

5. A small district in Austria has its own constitution, it is the entirely Catholic Vorarlberg, next neighbor to the Catholic Tyrol, both being subject to the same administration. Liberalism has no home here and Catholics can freely harmonize their practical ideal with their religious convictions. This they have done by a law passed in the Legislature of Vorarlberg in the year 1876. The first paragraph of that law under the heading: *Principles* for the organization of the Catholic elementary school system, reads thus:

I. "The entire, corporal as well as spiritual education of the child is by the law of nature a duty, and hence an inviolable right of the *family*.

II. "It is the duty of the Catholic family to give the child a *Catholic education*. The family cannot give the child a Catholic education without the *Church*. The Church, therefore, by reason of the right of the family, by reason of her own divine mission, has for her province the education of the child, by imparting knowledge in the matters of faith and morals, by dispensing the Sacraments and by supervising all other instruction, so that it may remain in harmony with her educational method.

III. "It is the office of the State to *protect* the rights of the family and also of the Church in education."[1]

Such is the language of the Catholic people of Austria! This is the true doctrine of the Church, these the principles of natural law, clearly evincing the proper conception of the State's office.

## FRANCE.

"In France," says the despatch, "legislation has entirely banished religious instruction from the public schools which are non-

1 See Osseg. L. c. p. 117.

sectarian, gratuitous and compulsory." One should think that American Catholics had but little to learn from such a state of things. Yet the author seems to judge otherwise. The French had no choice but to follow out certain well-known principles, sufficiently known to every Catholic in the United States, but the application of which everywhere and at all times is justified only by actual necessity. The despatch apparently wants to convey a different view, as is plain from the portions which Dr. Bouquillon italicizes. "The Deputy Brun suggested," it says, "the following modification: 'Upon the request of parents the ministers of certain creeds or persons deputed by them, *shall be allowed to impart religious instruction on the school-premises and outside of class hours;*'" and "the Bishops employed the official teachers *to give catechism lessons outside of the school-premises.*" This harmonizes excellently with the plan adopted in Minnesota and the authors of the latter thus find their justification in the fact that it is practised in France.

But the despatch forgets to add that the Bishops mentioned, viz., Guilbert, Dounet, Bonnechose and Freppel did not propose to surrender to the State any schools over which they had actual control and which were Catholic, and thus barter the religious for a neutral school, proclaiming that they would be satisfied with "outside" religious instruction.

In their last letter the French Cardinals expressed in most emphatic terms their indignation in view of the fact that the French youth should have been given over to the neutral State schools and they confess their regrets that they cannot remedy the evil by instituting free parochial schools. The renowned theologian, de Margerie, Professor at the Catholic University at Lille, describes in the "Revue de Lille" the evil which the godless schools have brought upon his country, and concludes with the remark that a people who defend State schools under such circumstances sign their own death warrant or "commit suicide." Listen to the judgment which experience and observation has forced from some impartial French Liberals, who have not sacrificed their convictions to anti-religious sects:

"We no longer live in a time," said Laboulaye, "when a minister can appear before the Chamber and say that public instruction and education belong to the State and are subject to the supreme directions of the Government. The hand by which the State tries to control the spirit of the rising generation, and the right which is claimed for the State power to form young according to its own

fashion, are to-day rejected by all parties whatsoever. We simply demand of the Government to guarantee us general security and private liberty, we *refuse to grant the State the right to take the place of the family and the individual.*[1]

"*Neutral instruction,*" declares Jules Simon, "*is no instruction.*" "The State," says the famous academician, as early as 1863, "is obliged to prepare for its own resignation" (in the matter of education).[2]

And Guizot: "Il faut que l'instruction soit profondement religieuse, pour qu'elle soit vraiment bonne et socialement utile. Et je n'entends pas seulement par là que l'enseignement religieux y doit tenir sa place, et que les pratiques de la religion y doivent être, observées; un peuple n'est pas élevé a de si petites et si méchaniques conditions: *il faut que l'éducation populaire soit donnée et reçue dans une atmosphere religieuse, que les impressions et les habitudes religieuses y pénètrent de tout part. La religion n'est pas une étude ou un exercice auquel on assigne son lieu et son heure; c'est une loi qui doit se faire sentir constamment et partout, et qui n'exerce qu'a ce prix, sur l'âme et la vie, toute sa salutaire action. C'est à dire que dans les écoles primaires, l'influence religieuse doit être habituellement présente.*" (Mémoires, tome III, pp. 68–69.)

## ITALY.

We shall not dwell on the official State-schools of modern Italy; but merely intend to mention the two facts emphasized by the despatch, namely, that the "public school is obligatory," and that "a concerted effort is everywhere being made (by the Catholics) to promote religious instruction in the public schools by *a prudent compliance with circumstances.*" We patiently wait for another despatch to tell us wherein the "prudent compliance with circumstances" consists, and, above all, what Catholics are to gain by it! In the meantime it suffices for us to know what the despatch itself concedes, viz., that practically the Italian school-law "is very

1 "Nous ne sommes plus en temps où un ministre (Royer-Collard) pouvait dire à la chambre que l'instruction et l'éducation publique appartiennent à l'état et sont sous la directions suprême du gouvernement. Cette main mise sur l'esprit des générations nouvelles, ce droit reconnu à la puissance publique de faconner à saguise la jeunesse, sont aujourd'hui repoussés par tous les parties, sans distinction d'opinion. Nous ne demandons plus au gouvernement que de guarantir la sécurité générale et la liberté privée, nous refusons á l'état de se substituer à la famille et a l'individu." (See Verhaeghen, "l'Etat hors de l'Ecole," p. 22.)

2 L'enseignement neutre est un enseignement nul; "L'Etat est obligé de préparer sa destitution," (en matière d'instruction.) Ibid. p. 51.

troublesome and prejudicial." The practical conclusion for us is to be found in the example of the Holy Father himself, who "has founded many free schools in Rome," the more so, because we know that *free Catholic schools* are the practical ideal of Leo XIII. for all countries in which they are possible.[1]

## BELGIUM.

What the despatch tells of Belgium surprised us most of all. The report is incomplete as well as inexact; far from giving even an approximately correct conception of the Belgian situation in regard to schools, it is designed to create a false impression concerning it. Yet Belgium, of all countries in the world, is the one that might teach American Catholics a most salutary lesson by the stand it has taken in the school question. The reason is: 1st. Because Belgium is, by virtue of its constitution, the freest country of Europe. 2d. In no other country, particularly during the past fifteen years, has the school question been treated more thoroughly by Catholics in the Legislature or spoken and written about more exhaustively. 3d. Nowhere did Catholics have a better opportunity of giving full expression to the Catholic principles on instruction and education both theoretically and practically. 4th. Nowhere were the divinely appointed teachers of the people—the Bishops—more free and independent in upholding the principles of the Church; nowhere were these principles carried out with greater determination and unanimity. 5th. For many years the Catholics of Belgium were in the same situation with regard to schools as Americans are, for all the State schools were declared neutral. Lastly—6th. The Catholics were given an opportunity of expressing their views regarding religious instruction outside of school hours, which the State allowed and urged.

Our despatch says nothing about the principle or the doctrine which the Catholics of Belgium defended in this question. It tells us nothing about their practical ideal, much less does it make mention of the great struggle for free parochial schools, a struggle in which the Belgian Catholics were really "a spectacle unto angels and men." At all this the "interested prelate" does not even hint, but rather leaves the reader, unacquainted with the circumstances and under the impression that the Belgian episcopate was foremost in urging the compromise in favor of the neutral school and as though

1 See Letter of Leo XIII. to the Bishops of England, Nov., 1886.

this were done by order of the Pope himself! The following is the entire report, italics included, upon Belgium.

In 1879 the Holy See obliged the Belgian episcopate to assume the same position (as the French Catholics) with regard to M. Frère-Orban's law on non-sectarian education. It is true that in the beginning the Bishops of Belgium refused to authorize the State school teachers to teach the catechism. But the instructions given by the Cardinal of Mechlin, June 14, 1880, which in accordance with the Pope's demand, considerably modified those previously issued, simply forbade the teachers to presume to teach the catechism "without having obtained from ecclesiastical authority explicit permission to do so, which permission, for certain special reasons, may be granted them." In 1879 Monsg. Vannutelli wrote, by order of the Pope, to the Cardinal of Mechlin: "I find the principle under consideration very just and very much in accordance with the decisions of the Roman congregations, viz.: *That those schools alone deserve condemnation in which there is a true and real danger* to the faith or morals of the pupils. Hence if, notwithstanding the new law, this or that school, under whatsoever management it may be, offers no real danger to the faith and morals of the pupils, said school is to be exempted from the general condemnation, and children cannot be forbidden to attend such schools."

Does it not seem from this report as if the Belgian Bishops could teach us better how to hide the Catholic standard instead of openly unfurling it as they actually had done? Surely the solution of the school question for us Catholics does not consist in merely making concessions to the arrogant claims of others. To the honor of Belgium and for the sake of truth, let us correct these misstatements and briefly relate the true condition of things in that land of valiant Catholics. We do this not without a glow of enthusiasm, for we were privileged to witness in person what we believe to be the grandest success in the effort to settle the school problem which our century has thus far seen.

I. The following is a summary of the political programme of the Belgian Catholics on "the rights of the State:"

*a.*—The representatives of the Belgian Catholics in the Legislative Chambers have not at any time defended compulsory State instruction or education, they *never admitted State compulsion* of any kind; on the contrary, they always rejected it explicitly both as a principle and as a practical measure, and they still reject it vigorously to this day.

*b.*—The Belgian Catholics, in their programmes or in the laws which they enacted, never recognized the so-called "State's own rights," viz. : any "proper" and "special" right of the State over education, but they emphatically denied the existence of any such proper right.

*c.*—Parochial schools, free and independent of the State, were and are even now the practical ideal of Belgian Catholics. According to their view the part of the State in the solution of the school question is none other than that it should *guarantee the freedom of the family* in the matter of education. The only purpose of the public schools is, according to the Catholic view, to supplement the efforts of the family and the individual. When this is necessary, then and only then the State may exercise authority in the field of education.

*d.*—As regards the neutral public schools the Belgian Catholics in and outside of the legislative body have publicly condemned them. They persistently *refused* a proffered compromise of the Liberals respecting *religious instruction outside of the school hours* as irreconcilable with the dignity of the Church and of religion. The Belgian *Constitution itself* is an irrefutable proof of this. It was framed in the year 1830, when Belgium, after the revolution against the King of Holland, William I, had declared its independence. Catholics were in a great majority in the constitutional congress. The Constitution itself was the outcome of a union with the Liberals (who at that time were not so fanatical as later on) on the basis of freedom. Art. 14 of this fundamental act guarantees "liberty of worship." Art. 17 reads thus : "Instruction is free ; every prohibitory measure is forbidden. The repression of misdemeanors is regulated only by law. Public instruction at the expense of the State is also regulated by law."[1]

Hence there were to be no obligatory State schools whether denominational or neutral. Nay the Constitution does not even express the obligation of the State to organize public or official State schools; it can do so in a case of necessity, viz. when parents, though they enjoy perfect liberty, are unable to provide for the instruction of their children.[2]

1 "L'enseignement est libre ; toute mesure préventive est interdite ; la répression des délits n'est réglée que par la loi. L'instruction publique donnée aux frais de l'Etat est également réglée par la loi."

2 "Cela (l'article 17 de la Constitution) veut-il dire que cet enseignement de l'Etat, cet enseignement public sera *organise de droit*, que ce soit un *enseignement national? Non*, jamais on n'a pu admettre cette interprètation. L'enseignement de l'Etat vient remplir la lacune laissée par l'enseignement libre, et l'enseignement de l'Etat ne doit exister que lorsque cette lacune se prèsente." Senator Baron Surmont de Volsbeghe, Feb. 5, 1892.

Let us hear the words of one of the many framers of the Constitution. Nothomb explaining the spirit and the meaning of the Constitution declared in 1836: "The maintenance of public order lies within the domain of the Government. Outside of this the State is powerless. *Intellectual religious and moral direction is not within the sphere of politics.* Our society has thought itself strong, upright enough, to maintain its own direction in matters of intelligence, religion and morality. *This is what especially distinguishes Belgium;* we might sum up the articles of the Constitution thus: *no intervention on the part of the Government in the intellectual, moral and religious direction of the country.*"[1]

This Constitution has its full force as the fundamental Belgian law *to this day.* Just at this moment the Chambers are preparing themselves for the first time to revise certain articles therein, but as regards the article on instruction not even a motion was made to change it in any way.

The Liberal party, which during the last twenty years has openly shown its hostility against religion, does not conceal that liberty of instruction is a stumbling-block in its way. In Belgium as well as elsewhere they want to de-Christianize the country through the State, and one of the wishes they would have realized is compulsory instruction. At the time when they were in power, of which we shall speak directly, they openly proclaimed the device of the Revolution, "Secular instruction, gratuitous and obligatory." But in Belgium a change in the Constitution requires a two-thirds majority. The Liberals cannot expect this much, least of all at present. If, however, the above article were changed to-day with the consent of Catholics, *it would certainly not be in favor of the advocates of State schools.* The intervention of the State would probably be still more restricted, perhaps entirely excluded. Even during the school struggle, 1879–1884, the watchword with many Catholics was "L'Etat hors de l'école." The State has no business in the school! Minister Malou declared in 1879 that "this summary way of solving the question had a great many adherents among the Catholics of the Parliament;" that "it is the best and most glorious solution of the school question."[2]

1 Verhaeghen op. cit. pag. 28. See also ibid. the declarations of other prominent members of the Constitutional Congress.

2 La premiere des solutions, celle qui compte de nombreux partisans dans nos rangs a ete formulee: "l'Etat hors de l'ecole!" c. a. d. abdication complete des pouvoirs publics, Etat, provinces, communes; une confiance absolue dans l'action de la liberte seule. Au point de vue de la force de la nation, de la liberte, de l'energie qui doivent exister dans tous les

Before him Minister Dechamps, brother of the late Cardinal, had declared "free concurrence" to be the system which suited Catholics best.[1] The following fact is very significant. Two months ago, on February 5, 1892, the school question was again touched upon during a discussion on the budget of the Interior, the leader of the Catholic party in the Senate, Mr. Lammens, clearly and unequivocally laid down the principal "*l'etat hors de l'ecole*" *as the practical ideal* of Belgian Catholics, and declared that in the whole of Belgium "Catholic parents feel a deep aversion for the State schools."[2] In the same session Baron Orban de Xivey styled this solution of the school question: "*The desire of all those who have the welfare of society at heart,*" "*The traditional principle which is a distinctive character of the Belgian nation.*"[3] Baron Lurmont de Volsberghe closed his brilliant speech, on that same day, with the words, "the true principle is 'away with the State out of the school,' and, I repeat, I hope that I myself shall see it realized."[4]

The reader will now understand the reason why the defenders of compulsory education and of the rights of the State over education could not appeal to Belgium. This explains perhaps the laconism or rather the dead silence of the despatch upon the real point in question. But it, furthermore, fails to give us correct information concerning the position of Catholics regarding *neutral* schools. This becomes plain when we consider:

II.—*The position of the Belgian Episcopate and the Belgian Catholics towards neutral schools.*

Belgian Catholics were not satisfied to defend the principle of freedom of instruction. They evinced a constant and untiring zeal for its practical accomplishment. Immediately after the year 1830 they began under the leadership of the Bishops, among whom Mgr.

elements d'une nation libre, c'etait certainement la meilleure solution et c'eut ete la plus glorieuse."

Malou also adds the reason why the Belgian Catholics did not realize by *legislation* this practical ideal: namely, because the Liberals could not endure Catholic concurrence in the establishment of free schools. He says: "Si elle (cette solution) ne peut pas se realister, ce n'est pas notre faute, c'est bien la votre. Nous avons fait notre grande et large part dans cette oeuvre sociale de la diffusion de l'enseignement populaire. Nons serious en droit de vous dire aujourd 'hui: Nous avons fait notre part, faites la votre."

1 See Verhaegen, p. 43.

2 "Je prends acte de ces faits pour justifier *la repulsion* que les peres de familles Catholiques eprouvent pour l' enseignement officiel.

3 "Le rêve de tous les gens qui ont a coeur l'avenir de la société," "Le principe traditionnel qui est le caractere particulier de la nation belge."

4 "Le principe vrai, c'est l'Etat hors de l'école, et, je le répète, j'espère en voir un jour la réalisation."

van Bommel, Bp. of Liége, a famous educator, deserves special mention, to erect free schools, without any and every State intervention. The Liberals, as a liberal paper openly confessed, were unable to cope with this kind of courageous self-sacrifice. Therefore, they desired State aid and asked that it be conceded by law. The Catholics met them with that magnanimity which is characteristic of the defenders of truth. They declared that they could do very well without the aid of the State, but admitted it out of consideration for their adversaries. However, they put the condition that the religious character of the schools to be erected by the State should not be interfered with. Thus the school law of 1842 was brought about, which Dechamps very correctly characterized as a "transaction" or a "concordat" when he said: "We admitted State instruction; they (the Liberals) granted legal religious instruction; this was our concordat."[1]

The law reads thus: Art. VI, "Primary instruction necessarily embraces the teaching of religion and morals . . . . . Instruction in religion and morals is under the direction of the ministers of the creed professed by the majority of the pupils in the schools." Art. VII, "The superintendence of the schools . . . . . as regards instruction in religion and morals is to be exercised by the delegates of the heads of the various creeds." "The ministers of creeds or their delegates *will at all times have the right to inspect the school.*"[2]

At that time one of the leaders of the Liberals, Minister Lebau, could still say: "I would consider an anti-religious school-master a real pest."[3]

But the anti-religious evolution of Liberalism worked itself out in Belgium as elsewhere. The cry: "*il faut arracher les âmes á*

1 "Voici ce qui s'est passé en 1842, l'opinion libérale se rattachait plutót aux *idees francaises*, elle demandait qu'on fortifiat *l'action du gouvernement*. L' opinion catholique se rattachait plutôt à l' *idee anglaise*, au systeme de *libre concurrence* . . . . Quelle fut la transaction? . . . . Nous cé dions l'enseignement de l' Etat, on cédait l'enseignement religieux légal. Voilà quel fut ce concordat." (Verhaegen p. 43-44.)

See also the masterly exposition of Catholic principles in reference to this law in the "Exposé des vrais principes sur l'éducation publique, par Mgr. van Bommel, évêque de Liege," particularly p. 86-87.

2 Art. 6. L'instruction primaire comprend nécessairement l'enseignement de la religion et de la morale . . . . l'enseignement de la religion et de la morale est donné sous la direction des ministres du culte professé par la majorité des élèves de l'école."

Art. 7. "La surveillance des écoles . . . quant à l'enseignement de la religion et de la morale sera exercée par les délégués des chefs des cultes. Les ministres des cultes et les délégués du culte auront, en tout temps, le droit d'inspecter l'école."

3 "Je n'hésite pas a répondre que je regarderais un institutur primaire anti-religieux comme une véritable peste." (Verhaegen, p. 31.)

*l'èglise*" by and by became its open motto, and when the ministry of Frere-Bara-Vanhumbeeck came to the helm, in 1878, it immediately manifested its purpose to abrogate the law of 1842, and—of course in the interest of "liberty of conscience" and "national education"—to establish State schools, and neutral State schools at that, for all communities alike. As soon as this intention became manifest a common Pastoral from the six Belgian Bishops appeared, in which they condemned with apostolic fearlessness the neutral schools and prepared Catholics for the approaching contest.[1]

But the resolve of the Loges to de-christianize Belgium, small in territory but strong as a bulwark of the Church, did not abate. A new law, entirely contrary to the spirit and even the letter of the Constitution was passed by the Chambers, (by a majority of *one* vote in the Senate). The fundamental article of this law, which is of special interest to us here, reads :

Art. IV. "Religious instruction in the public schools is henceforth to be left to the care of families and to the ministers of the various creeds."

"A room in the school-building is to be at the disposal of the ministers of the various creeds to give religious instruction to the children of their denomination before or after school hours."[2]

It is important to note the tactics of the Freemasons when waging war against religion in a Catholic country. The hypocrisy of the second paragraph is engrafted upon the impiety of the one preceding ; first, religion is entirely banished from the school, then it is re-admitted theoretically whilst practically it is proscribed. Impiety begot the law, hypocrisy was its external garb. A further Pastoral of the Bishops, published immediately after the promulgation of this law, (June 1879) again condemned it and expressly prohibited parents and teachers from aiding to carry out the same. The words of the Bishops re-echoed in the hearts of all the people. A formidable opposition was organized and the most prominent Catholic Deputies as leaders of the people stood firmly by the Bishops. The Liberals were not prepared for so decisive an opposition, hence the Ministry tried by addresses and circulars to the people to win them to the persuasion that "nothing was changed," ("rien n'est changé !") that "la religion du peuple," "la religion de

1 "Lettre Pastorale," Dec. 7, 1878.

2 "L'enseignement religieux est laissée aux soins des familles et des ministres des divers cultes." "Un local dans l'école est mis à la disposition des ministres des cultes pour y donner soit avant, soit après l'heure des classes, l'enseignement religieux aux enfants de leur communion fréquentant l'école."

nos pères" is still held in honor and that it is only intended more distinctly to guard liberty of conscience etc. Vanhumbeeck went so far as to allow teachers to impart religious instruction even *during school hours* "as it was formerly done." The people were only by degrees to be made familiar with "the principle" that the school belongs to the State alone and is in no wise under ecclesiastical supervision. We have to keep all these circumstances, in mind, the better to understand and appreciate the energetic measures which the Bishops eventually took. They first of all appealed to Catholic doctrine and the express decisions of the Holy See *especially to the decree of Pius IX, for the United States,* 24 Nov. 1875, thus to "reprove and condemn" the neutral schools, which "*by their very nature, and precisely on account of their neutrality are dangerous and harmful, an attack upon faith, upon piety, and the religious rights of the Belgian people.*" In their instructions they put as a general principle: "eas (scholas publicas *ex se* malas et nocivas) *nec frequentare, nec instituere, nec regere licet.*" Exceptions, (si causam gravem habent et praeterea occasio proxima fit remota) for parents as well as for teachers were of course provided for. One item of the instructions of Sept. 1, 1879, which concerns us here in a special manner, lay in the fact that the Bishops *withdrew from all teachers* of the State schools the *missio canonica, forbade all of them without exception to give religious instruction* upon the ground that the Church "cannot allow that Catholic doctrine be taught *in her name* in schools which are in themselves objectionable, opposed to the tenets of Catholic belief, and established to the injury of religion."[1]

The Bishops thought it necessary in the beginning of the struggle not to allow a single exception to this rule, in order at the outset not to imperil the erection of free Catholic schools, and play into the hands of the Government *which* only *allowed religious instruction for the purpose of retaining the children in the State schools.* They stated expressly in the first instruction that this general prohibition was necessary "in circumstantiis in quibus nunc patria nostra versatur." After the Pastorals had effected their purpose and had sufficiently convinced the people of the dangerous character of neutral schools, they could, without in the least denying the principle, allow exceptions in particular cases; hence it is said in the resolutions of June 14, 1880, which the despatch mentions, that "teachers are not permitted to explain the catechism in

1 Instructiones practicae pro confessariis, Sept. 1, 1879.

State schools *sine expressa auctoritatis ecclesiasticae licentia quae ob peculiares rationes concedi poterit.*[1] But let us not forget that the Belgian Bishops *never authorized* the clergy or teachers to give *religious instruction* according to the intention of the Government in the department set aside in the school, *outside of school hours.* "You are not so simple," they said, addressing the faithful, "as to allow yourselves to be deceived, and thereby second the true intentions of our adversaries. The school is not a building, four walls and the floor and ceiling of a class-room ; the school is the teacher imparting his lessons to his assembled pupils. Religion taught in the school is religious instruction as it is imparted by the teacher or with his assistance during class and as a class matter, under the guidance of the Church."[2]

The grand result which the Belgian Bishops achieved is the best proof of the wisdom of their measures. "We shall make the earth produce millions, that we may combat this *loi de malheur*, the *écoles sans Dieu* and erect a Catholic school in the shadow of every Church." These words of the Parliamentary leader of the Catholics, Mr. Malou, were literally verified. In less than four years more than 3000 Catholic schools were erected in that little country with its small population of only six millions, while official State schools were more and more deserted, and especially country school teachers had often to face empty benches.

In 1884 the country freed itself from the Masonic yoke in the memorable elections which have been truly styled "le suffrage de l'indignation universelle." A Catholic Ministry came into power and is holding it to this day supported by a majority greater than which no party ever had in the Belgian Parliament. The true reason of this triumph was the "caractère traditionel" of the Belgians, alluded to above, the "aversion" which the Catholics of the country felt against the Liberal tyranny of conscience. The Catholic

1 A Belgian Bishop, who took a prominent part in the struggle, writing to us on the subject, says: "When the Belgian Bishops in the beginning of the school struggle refused to allow the catechism to be taught in all the State schools it was evidently not because they held this unlimited prohibition to be prescribed by their principles ; but they thought this provision necessary in order that the country might not be deceived by the notorious formula "rien n'est changé," in order that in a Catholic country a law might not be acclimatized, which was the more criminal because it combined with malicious impiety a most perfidious hypocrisy. We did not choose to go into the trap which the Freemasons had set for us ; we did not want to permit the faithful to be deceived and look upon a school system as lawful which the Church severely and justly condemned. Later when we had accomplished this, nothing stood in the way of allowing the *missio canonica* under certain circumstances to those who deserved it.

2 Pastoral letter Jan. 31, 1879.

Ministry of Malou-Jacobs naturally did away with the Masonic law and substituted in its stead a school law which above all else breathes the spirit of constitutional freedom and which excludes State compulsion in every form.

After these facts there remains but little to say regarding the statements which the despatch makes. We have only to add that—

1. It is *not true* "that in 1879 the Holy See obliged the Belgian episcopate to assume the same position (as the French Bishops) with regard to Frère-Orban's school law on non-sectarian education." The Holy See never did this, neither in 1879 nor at any other time. The conditions in Belgium were not at all the same as those in France.

2. As to the pretended "considerable modification" of the episcopal instructions, the reader will judge for himself from what has been said.

3. It is true that the Nuncio to Belgium, Mgr. Vannutelli, wrote to the Cardinal of Mechlin in the alleged manner, but it is *not true* that he did so "*by order of the Pope.*" A moral theologian will know that the general principle contained in the utterances of the Nuncio was speculatively correct, and the Belgian Bishops never denied it. According to the maxim "consilium tenemur non contemnere, non vero sequi," they, in consideration of the peculiar situation of the Belgian Catholics, have always maintained their own practical application of the advice given by the Nuncio. Their regulations, therefore, "de frequentandis scholis publicis," have always remained the same, and they were also approved of at Rome.

4. From the despatch it appears that there was a difference of opinion between the Holy See and the Belgian Bishops. The reader unacquainted with the circumstances would so conclude. Yet it is not the case. On the contrary, the Holy See publicly and solemnly approved of the stand which the Belgian Bishops and Catholics had taken; and all this in spite of a Masonic Government, which in a manner coerced the Nuncio to obtain from Rome a declaration opposed to the Bishops. To accomplish this Frère-Orban employed diplomatic intrigues as well as bold impertinence; the most abject and despicable means which he used against the Holy Father was the threat to dismiss the Nuncio and to break off all diplomatic relations with the Holy See in case of refusal. If we consider the humiliation which such a threat implied and must have caused the august prisoner of the Vatican we find it doubly regretful that his situation should have been made the background of a

discussion about the Belgian school law. The Holy Father himself wrote twice to the King of the Belgians, asking him to repeal this law. Cardinal Nina, Secretary of State, sent one despatch after another to the Nuncio and the Ministry in answer to the infamous reproaches of Frère. The Vatican did not wish to leave any means untried in order to prevent a break with the Government of a Catholic land. But Frère was not satisfied ; he recalled the Belgian Minister from Rome and banished the Papal Nuncio.

And, what conclusion are we to draw from the various documents regarding the school question which at that time were sent from Rome to Brussels? The Curia has published these documents and clearly indicated the inference which is just and natural. They are a splendid vindication of the Holy See and of the Belgian episcopate.[1] We shall have to omit giving even a brief extract from the documents which lie before us. It is enough to allude to the Allocution of August 20, 1880, in which the Holy Father makes known to the whole world his judgment concerning the action of the Bishops and people of Belgium.

"We have," says the Sovereign Pontiff, "repeatedly condemned the Belgium school law, and reprove and condemn it again" . . . "The Belgian Bishops understood perfectly what the circumstances and their duty demanded from them ; they employed all their energy in order to keep from such schools the youth entrusted to their care, and for this reason they erected Catholic schools." . . . "It is a great honor for the Belgians that they devoted themselves so willingly to this eminently opportune work." . . . "In order not to be the occasion of increased hostility, we in the spirit of Christian charity advised the Bishops to proceed mildly in carrying out their prescribed regulations, and to use clemency in the application of the penalties of their laws." . . . "But all this did not satisfy the Belgian Ministers. They wanted us to rebuke the Belgian Bishops who most energetically fulfilled their duty, to find fault with conduct which merits naught but praise. We constantly and spontaneously rejected such exactions." . . "The same odious and gratuitous pretexts were employed to banish our

1 "Collection des documents publiés par le Saint-Siège relatifs à la question de l'instruction primaire en Belgique et à la cessation des rapports diplomatiques entre le gouvernement belge et le Saint-Siège," Malines, 1880. The following quotations contain the the gist of the whole: "Les évêques belges, en s'opposant à la nouvelle loi, afin de la rendre moins funeste aux fidèles dan son application, ont obéi a un devoir sacré de leur ministère, et n'ont jamais pu être désapprouvés en cela par le Saint-Siège," p. 13. "C'est sans aucun fondement et méme par une insinuation malveillante qu 'on a voulu accréditer le bruit d'un désaccord sur cette question centre le Saint-Siegè et l'Episcopat Belge," p. 16.

Nuncio; it is evident that the dismissal was made solely because we refused to be traitorously false to our duty, because we would in no wise separate ourselves from our venerable brethren, the Bishops of Belgium, *with whom we are of one accord* as we had previously testified."

## Concluding Reflection.

In conclusion we may be permitted to make the following brief reflection:

1.—What is the real school question for American Catholics? Is it not, first of all, by what schools and methods shall we *most surely* save the souls of our children? Where shall we find the *best guarantees* for the preservation of their faith and their virtue? In what schools are the dangers, by which both are menaced, warded off *most effectually?*

The answer need not come from ourselves. Competent judges, representatives of the authority of the Church, have already given their opinion and their instructions, and that in the most solemn manner, in our Plenary Councils.

Our Bishops legislating on the subject were not ignorant of the laws or of the conduct of European Catholics in regard to them; and it would be absurd and unjust to say that they were not familiar with the "theoretical principles," either theological or philosophical, of this important matter. Now, our Bishops say not a word about inducing Catholic writers to defend what is called the special mission or the particular rights of the State over education. They nowhere intimate that Catholics injure their own cause by denying or not defending these rights and this mission. Indeed some influential members of our hierarchy have more recently endeavored to remove all doubts upon this subject from our minds by declaring in an unequivocal manner that in their opinion the principle of State right in this matter belongs as little to Catholic discipline as to American tradition.

But we find something more than this in the solemn utterances of the assembled Fathers in Plenary Council. In taking up the grave problem of education the Council fixes at the outset upon a very positive programme, which indicates the attitude which all Catholics ought to hold. It may be summed up in these words: *The defence of the rights of the Church in the school, against the encroachments of the modern State.* To begin with, the Council shows its

realization of the present needs by declaring in the very opening sentence that it faces the school question as a serious conflict with the spirit of our own difficult time in which the State seeks supreme control. "*Si ullo unquam tempore, certo haec hac nostra aetate Ecclesia Dei et spiritus saeculi mirando quodam et acerrimo conflixere duello.*"

It adds immediately after: "*Homines enim spiritu mundano penitus imbuti iam multis ab annis, nullum non movent lapidem, ut Ecclesiae, quod ipsa a Christo accepit, Catholicam iuventutem docendi munus eripiant et in manus societatis civilis tradant vel subdant gubernii saecularis potestati.*"

From this declaration, so grave and formal, and from the explanation of it given by the Council, logic and Catholic instinct deduce the following conclusions:

*a.*—It is the solemn duty of American Catholics, especially in our days, to defend the principle that "the Church has received from Christ the mission of educating the young."

*b.*—It is their duty to combat the tendency which teaches "that this mission should be conferred upon the State," or that it "should be subordinated to the power of the State."

All the principles announced by the Council accord perfectly with the doctrine which denies the pretended mission of the State, while the advocates of that mission will search in vain for the least support of their theories in the authentic teaching of the American Church.

2.—Do the authorities of the Catholic Church at present exaggerate the dangers of the neutral or secular school?

The Council has sketched those dangers in plain words and they are evidently true:

*Inter eos qui hanc educationem mere secularem strenue advocant, non pauci quidem inveniuntur, qui nec religioni ullum detrimentum afferre nec iuventuti pericula parare velint. Attamen ex ipsa rei natura sequitur, et tristissima etiam experientia comprobatur, educationem mere secularem paulatim ita degenerare, ut fiat irreligiosa et impia, adolescentium fidei et moribus maxima perniciosa.* (Cap. 1.)

Hence the conclusion of the Council in harmony with that of the Holy See: The erection of Catholic schools is "the best and only means" of assuring the good education of our children (*Optimum, immo unicum quod superest medium,*) and in the solution of the school question "nothing is more necessary than the foundation of Catholic schools." (*Omnium consensu nil tam necessarium.*)

Under such circumstances can any one believe that he renders a service to the cause of Catholic education in America by emphasizing the advantages of European State schools?

The Council obliges the priests and the faithful in the most solemn manner (*conscientias sacerdotum et fidelium . . . strictissime oneramus*) to found Catholic schools, even at the cost of great sacrifices. It is useless to insist here on the difficulties with which the enlightened zeal and the generous devotion of Catholics often come in contact. It is on that account that the Council devotes so much space to the consideration of this subject (six pages,)[1] of how best to promote the erection of parish schools. Surely the recent agitation in favor of State control and the message of "the Berlin prelate," which is evidently a part of it, has shown itself to be out of harmony with the Catholic spirit of our country.

We affirm, without fear of contradiction from any quarter, that this whole latest controversy so recklessly provoked among Catholics by the advocates of State control has not helped to construct a single school. God grant that it may have been equally ineffectual in preventing or destroying any!

JOS. SCHROEDER.

1 *De viis et mediis scholas parochiales quam maxime promovendi.*

## ANALECTA.

### JUS RECENTIUS DE MATRIMONIO NON PRAESUMENDO.

LEO PP. XIII.

*Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.*

Consensus mutuus, unde matrimonia iusta nascuntur, non verbis dumtaxat sed aliis quoque signis exterioribus patefieri ac declarari potest. Quamobrem Alexander III,* Innocentius III,† et Gregorius IX,‡ decessores Nostri, merito decreverunt ut carnalis copula, si sponsalia de futuro certa ac valida praecessissent, cum in iudicio tum extra iudicium pro vero coniugio haberetur, nisi impedimentum canonicum obstitisset. Et in hac iuris praesumptione tantum roboris inesse voluerunt, ut firmum ipsa statueret sanciretque ius nec probationem contrariam ullam admitteret. Deinde vero matrimonia clandestina, id est non praesente Parocho et duobus tribusve testibus inita, quum Concilium Tridentinum ⁋ irrita infectaque esse iussisset, ius illud priscum, ut erat necesse, valere desiit ubicumque promulgata vel moribus usuque recepta Tridentina lex. Quibus autem illa locis non viget, in iis semper Apostolicae Sedis iudicium fuit, canones, quos indicavimus, ratos atque firmos permansisse. Sed aetatum decursu, ex conscientia et cognitione christianorum sensim effluxere. Plures enim Episcopi ex iis regionibus, in quibus matrimonia clandestina contra fas quidem inita, sed tamen valida iudicantur, haud ita pridem rogati quid populus ea de re sentire videretur, plane retulerunt, canonicam de coniugiis praesumptis disciplinam passim exolevisse desuetudine atque oblivione deletam: propterea vix aut ne vix quidem contingere ut copula inter sponsos affectu maritali nec fornicario habeatur: eamque non matrimonii legitimi usum sed fornicationis peccatum communi hominum opinione existimari: imo vix persuaderi populo posse, sponsalia de futuro per coniunctionem carnalem in matrimonium transire.

His igitur rebus et causis, de consilio Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium in rebus fidei Inquisitorum generalium, supra memoratos canones et alias quascumque iuris canonici ea de re dispositiones, etiam speciali mentione dignas, per hoc Decretum Nostrum abrogamus et abolemus, et pro abolitis et abrogatis, ac si nunquam prodiissent, haberi volumus.

* Cap. *Veniens*, de Sponsal. † Cap. *Tuanos*, eodem tit. ‡ Cap. *Is qui fidem*, eodem tit.
⁋ Sess. XXIV. Cap. I de Reform. matrim.

Simul per has litteras Nostras decernimus ac mandamus ut deinceps illis in locis in quibus coniugia clandestina pro validis habentur, a quibusvis iudicibus ecclesiasticis, in quorum foro causas eiusmodi matrimoniales agitari et iudicari contingeret, copula carnalis sponsalibus superveniens non amplius ex iuris praesumptione coniugalis contractus censeatur, nec pro legitimo matrimonio agnoscatur seu declaretur. Huius tamen auctoritate Decreti induci nolumus necessitatem formae Tridentinae servandae ad matrimonii validitatem ubi illa forma modo non vigent.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 15 Februarii, MDCCCLXXXXII, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo quarto.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

## PRIVILEGES OF THE BLUE SCAPULAR.

*Indulgences.*

According to a Rescript of Pius IX, 7th June, 1850, the indulgences of the Blue Scapular may, without exception, be applied to the Poor Souls in Purgatory. The usual conditions for gaining the Indulgences are Confession, Communion and Prayer according to the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff.

*Plenary Indulgences.*

1. On the day of investiture.
2. For a priest on the day of his First Mass.
3. At the hour of death.
4. At the Annual Retreat.
5. On the first Sunday of every month.
6. On Saturdays in Lent.
7. On Passion Sunday and Friday of Passion week.
8. On Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of Holy Week.
9. On Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost and Trinity Sunday.
10. On the feasts of the Immaculate Conception, the Nativity, Purification, Annunciation and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
11. On the principal feasts of the Theatine Order, viz. : St. Joseph (19th March), Bl. Joseph Mary Thomasio (24th March), Finding of the Holy Cross (3d May), Bl. Paul Buralis (17th June), St. John Baptist (24th June), SS. Peter and Paul (29th June), on the last Sunday of July, on Portiuncula (2d Aug.), St. Cajetan (7th Aug.), St. Augustine (28th Aug.), Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14th Sept.), St. Michael Arch. (29th Sept.), Gardian Angels (2d Oct.), St. Teresa (15th Oct.), All Saints (1st Nov.), St. Andrew Avellino (10th Nov.), Bl. John Marinonio (13th Dec.).
12. On the first and last days of a Novena for Christmas.—At the Forty Hours' Devotion once a year.—On the 12th April.—On one day of the year chosen by the wearer of the Scapular.

Besides the above, there are Plenary Indulgences attached to the visits made to any church of the Theatines, to the Holy Land, to the church of the Portiuncula, to that of St. James of Compostella, and to any of the Seven Station churches in Rome.

*Partial Indulgences.*

1. An hour's meditation (60 yrs.).

2. Visiting the sick in order to relieve them spiritually or corporally, or, if prevented from doing so, by reciting the Pater, Ave and Gloria five times (20 yrs.).

3. On the Octaves of the feasts of Our Lord, and on the principal patron-feasts of the Augustinian, Dominican, Carmelite, Trinitarian and Servite Orders (20 yrs.).

4. On all feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, after receiving the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist; on accompanying the Blessed Sacrament when carried to the sick; on saying seven times the Pater, Ave and Gloria for the sick who have received the Blessed Sacrament; on visiting a church of the Theatines on any feast of the year; on reciting the Salve Regina at Vespers for the triumph of holy Church; on any day from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday, after receiving holy Communion or reciting seven times the Pater, Ave and Gloria for the triumph of holy Church; on the feasts of the Finding and Exaltation of the Holy Cross, after bestowing some alms; on three Fridays of every month after receiving holy Communion; on seven days during a Novena for Christmas; on every Monday upon visiting the Blessed Sacrament (7 yrs. and 7 quarant.).

5. Visiting a church and reciting five times the Pater, Ave and Gloria (5 yrs. and 5 quarant.).

6. Every day during the Octave of Pentecost (300 days).

7. Each time in attending the preaching of God's word (200 days).

8. On performing any work of piety (60 days).

9. On devoutly invoking the holy names of Jesus and Mary— reciting one Pater, Ave and Gloria for the living and the dead, in some church (50 days).

## BOOK REVIEW.

**PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By Father Liberatore, S. J. Translated by Edward Heneage Dering. —London: Art and Book Company. New York: Benziger & Co., 1891., 8v., pp. XXIV, 295.**

"This book is not addressed to the learned. That would have required greater powers and more knowledge. It is meant for aspirants and novices. *Virginibus puerisque Canto.* I could have wished for more time to write it in; but my advanced age of nearly eighty years forbade me to expect that." Thus Father Liberatore, after well nigh sixty years spent in the field of Catholic Philosophy, introduced his "Principles of Political Economy" to the world. With a modesty characteristic of a great mind he tells why he wrote "this little work." "On the one hand," he says, "I saw that our young men, not only laymen, but clerics also, had need of initiation in economic science, because it is interwoven with almost all the affairs of civil life; whilst, on the other, I found no course of instruction fitted to be a safe guide for them. The earlier writers on Political Economy had their minds mislead by the sensistic philosophy of their time; and philosophy, when bad, infects, being the root of them, all the other sciences. Those who came after, followed their predecessors blindly, or if they differed from them, wrote nevertheless under the influence of modern liberalism. Now, modern liberalism is like a blue bottle fly. Wherever it settles it leaves a germ of corruption and a bad smell. My intention, therefore, was to prepare something like a compendium of sound principles that would suffice to put young men on the right road, along which they might proceed safely. In carrying out this idea I have availed myself of the theories taught by the best professors, but not without freely discussing their doctrines and refuting their errors."

The work therefore embodies what its author aimed at—an exposition of the radical principles which run up from Ethics and pervade Economics —showing the way in which *public wealth* must be *produced*, *distributed* and *consumed*, so as to keep in harmony with man's nature, moral environment and destiny. It is needless to say that these principles Fr. Liberatore has firmly grasped, that he sets them forth in steady light and in their just bearing on the matter of economic science. The path of his teaching lies, as he says, between the Scylla of liberalism and the Charybdis of socialism. "Liberalism boasted of having introduced into the economic world two grand ideas, freedom and property; but to say the truth, instead of introducing it falsified them, desiring freedom without any restraint, and property unguarded by the duties of its possessor." He attacks both these errors, and shows "that unlimited competition is bad, and that the rich are bound to give their surplus to the poor. Socialism mainly rests

on the following assumptions: Firstly, that labor is the only source of wealth. Secondly, that the right of having property is dependent on the State. Thirdly, that the State, therefore, has a right to alter the foundations of it and make it collective, instead of individual." He shows first, "that the principal factors of wealth are natural agents, which are incorporated in matter, and are an object of appropriation; secondly, that the right of the individual man to have property is a natural right independent of the State; and thirdly, that the State cannot touch its essence. Private property cannot be justly abolished, even by agreement of all the States together."

These it will be noticed are the lines of the recent Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the labor problem. The book is therefore most timely as giving a scientific development to the truths sent out to the world in that great document.

The extracts we have given show that the translator has put the original in a neat English dress. There is just the faintest foreign color about the style, which, if anything, makes it more attractive. In two ways the version might have been made more useful: 1. by making it bear more on recent kindred English literature—though, of course this would have changed considerably the form of the matter and the compass of the volume; 2. by translating the Latin, French, etc., citations. This would have made the work more extensively available.

## AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE ROMAN QUESTION By Mgr. Jos. Schroeder, D. D., Ph. D., Prof. of Dogm. Theol. in the Cath. University of America.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1892.

The well-written defence by Mgr. Schroeder, of the just claims of the Holy See for independence, which appeared in a recent number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, has called forth much favorable comment. The question is one that is frequently misunderstood, even by Catholics, not because there is a lack of reason for a categorical answer to it, but through a false notion of historical facts and through impressions which are imbibed from popular reading and superficial reasoning. "I can easily understand," says Fr. Edmund O'Reilly, whose papers on the *Relations of the Church to Society* have just been republished, "a well-meaning, intelligent, educated Catholic replying, that as to the necessity (of the Temporal Power) there is none, and in his judgment, things would be better otherwise, not exactly as they have been since 1870, but with a different arrangement, still excluding the Temporal Power. I can understand, I say, a reply of this kind being given through want of accurate knowledge, and through impressions made by reading or hearing false statements and superficial sophistry; but I cannot understand its being innocently persevered in after even a brief explanation of how matters really stand." Such and similar reasons have induced the learned apologist of our American Catholic University to issue, in separate book form and considerably enlarged as to detail, the article on the "Roman Question" in the *Quarterly*.

What recommends the present publication in addition to its merits of style, thoroughness, erudition and the transparent spirit of loyal attachment to the Holy See which breathes from every page, is an analysis of the entire subject at the beginning of the treatise. This puts the reader from the outset into possession of the line of thought and argument and allows him to impress on his mind the various phases which ought to be emphasized in explaining or discussing the subject of the Temporal Power.

We hail these tokens from the Catholic University as signals which mark it as the central watchtower whence the standard of truth and doctrinal unity may ever be recognized by American Catholics and their unprejudiced brethren.

**THIRTY-TWO INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF MAY AND FOR THE FEASTS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. From the French. By Rev. Thos. F. Ward, Church of St. Charles, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Benziger Bros., 1892.**

What the careful translator claims in his Preface, namely, that these Instructions "are flowing with a spirit of piety, eminently practical, and especially free from all sentimentalism," is true. Not much more praise could be bestowed on a book, which as a rule, is always in demand by the clergy and of much utility to the laity.

**MARY QUEEN OF MAY AND OTHER "AVE MARIA" ESSAYS. By Brother Azarias.—The "Ave Maria," Notre Dame, Ind.**

"A handful of wayside flowers" from the garden of Notre Dame, planted there by an ardent lover, and offered in bright blue binding to Mary's children far and wide—such is this little book. There is so much of the Faberian grace in the flow of Brother Azarias' pen when he touches the theme of our Blessed Lady, that we wish he sang of her in all the intervals of grateful tranquillity which his serious tasks of discoursing on philosophical themes allow him. Spread the pretty volume ye Fathers in Christ and Children of Mary!

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

**GUIDE TO LATIN CONVERSATION,** containing a collection of useful words, a list of comparatives and of superlatives, the principal irregular verbs, familiar expressions and phrases, dialogue, etc., etc. By a Father of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the French of the seventh edition, by Prof. S. W. Wilby, Epiphany Apost. College.—Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.